

Volume 30, Number 6 • November, 1960

# JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL

American Society  
of Junior Colleges

# JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

The American Association of Junior Colleges will make available to libraries the present and future volumes of the *Junior College Journal* in microfilm form. Inquiries should be directed to University Microfilm, 313 North First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

---

VOLUME XXX

FEBRUARY 1960

NUMBER 6

---

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE IN THE DECADE AHEAD . . . . .	Marvin Knudson	307
RECENT STATE LEGISLATION AFFECTING JUNIOR COLLEGES . . . . .	S. V. Martorana	310
GOOD COMMUNITY RELATIONS HELP THE SMALL COLLEGE LIBRARY GROW . . . . .	A. H. Griffing	325
RECENT FACULTY AND INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES IN JUNIOR COLLEGES . . . . .	Ken August Brunner and Clarence B. Lindquist	327
A PROFILE OF JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS . . . . .	Ray Hawk	340
YOUR BEST FOOT FORWARD, PLEASE! . . . . .	Ione McClain	347
CAREER DAY ON CAMPUS: DAY OF EXPLORATION AND EXCITEMENT . . . . .	Larry Dorsett	349
ANALYSIS OF JUNIOR COLLEGE GROWTH . . . . .	Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr.	351
CURRENT PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED OF INTEREST TO JUNIOR COLLEGE READERS . . . . .	361	
RECENT WRITINGS		
JUDGING THE NEW BOOKS . . . . .		364

---

*JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL* is published monthly from September to May, inclusive. Subscription: \$4.00 a year, 50 cents a copy. Group subscriptions, to faculty of institutions which are members of the American Association of Junior Colleges: \$2.00 a year. Communications regarding editorial matters should be addressed to James W. Reynolds, College of Education, The University of Texas, P.O. Box 7996, Austin 12, Texas. Correspondence regarding advertisements and subscriptions should be addressed to Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., executive director of the American Association of Junior Colleges, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington 6, D.C. Entered as second-class matter November 22, 1923, at the Post Office at Washington, D.C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry at Austin, Texas, August 20, 1949.

[Printed in U.S.A.]

WILEY

BOOKS



## Introduction to Business Enterprise

By WAYNE L. McNAUGHTON, *University of California, Los Angeles*. This introductory textbook in the field of business has been written especially for students in the first or second year of college, and is suitable in either one-semester or one-year elementary business courses as offered in business, engineering, economics, and liberal arts curricula. The author prepares the student for actual business situations and acquaints him with the types of problems business men must solve. The whole book provides a quick working knowledge of the major fields of business, and, in so doing, it acts as an aid in choosing a career, and because it offers a view of the entire field, it enables an understanding of the relationships between all the basic principles.

**Ready in March. Approx. 520 pages. Prob. \$6.00**

## Essentials of Healthier Living

**A Realistic Text in Personal and Community Health**

By JUSTUS J. SCHIFFERES, *Health Education Council*. A rewritten version of *Healthier Living* (1954). It has almost as much in it as the older book, and many new important items have been added. *Essentials* is the product of direct and immediate response to the findings of a nationwide survey in which over 250 college instructors told what they wanted in a college health text. The material in the book reflects the significant medical and social research findings of the 1950's. Topics given particularly new treatment or emphasis include: physical fitness and physical education, space medicine, daily living habits, smoking, the teachable new "Essential" Food Guide, weight control, family profile, tranquilizers and other psychic drugs, the psychology of accidents, alcoholism, our aging population, chronic illness, radiation hazards, and many others.

**1960. 335 pages. Illus. \$5.50**

*Send for your examination copies today.*

**JOHN WILEY & SONS, Inc.**

**440 Park Avenue South, New York 16, N.Y.**

**A fresh approach to the study of human biology . . .**

## **HUMAN DEVELOPMENT**

**Phyllis C. Martin and Elizabeth Lee Vincent**—both Chatham College

**March 15.** Geared to student interest, this new textbook provides a unique understanding of the structure of the human body by combining an introduction to physiology with background material from embryology, anatomy, and psychology. Book discusses how intelligence, attitudes, and feelings affect and

are, in turn, affected by the body. Human development and behavior are related to man's physical, biological, and psychological environment. 275 imaginative, original drawings by William A. Osburn form an integral part of the book, illustrating not only structures, but also functions and ideas. 1960. 535 pp. **\$6.50**

## **BASIC MATHEMATICS**

**H. S. Kallenborn, Samuel A. Anderson, and Helen H. Kallenborn**

—all Memphis State University

**Offering a solid foundation for college mathematics, this highly teachable textbook assumes only a knowledge of simple arithmetic, stresses fundamental principles and a mastery of mechanical procedures. Presents essentials of arithmetic, elementary and intermediate alge-**

bra; basic theory and techniques of trigonometry, analytic geometry, and statistics. "A fine book. The coverage of statistics is particularly good."—W. N. Huff, University of Oklahoma. *Instructor's Manual* available. 1958. 74 ills., tables; 392 pp. **\$4.75**

## **HANDBOOK of ENGLISH**

**James A. S. McPeek, University of Connecticut; Austin Wright,**

*Carnegie Institute of Technology*

This handbook gives the freshman student sound guidance in all the fundamentals of English usage. Analyzes both the broad, general problems of composition and the details of sentence structure, parts of speech, paragraphing, diction, etc. Contains a wide selection of exercise material drawn from American and Eng-

lish literature plus examples of student themes which illustrate what to do and what to avoid. "A straightforward, sensible, and clearly organized handbook."—Howard Mumford Jones, Harvard University. *Now in convenient 5% x 8 format.* 1956. 10 ills.; 562 pp. **\$3.50**

## **PERSONAL FINANCE**

**Elvin F. Donaldson, The Ohio State University**

Practical advice on all types of personal financial problems. This widely used textbook shows how to analyze them and how best to solve them. Covers life and health insurance, social security benefits, borrowing money, credit, budgeting, automobile and medical insurance, etc. Discusses all types of investments; buying

and maintaining a home, taxes, the preparation of a will. Includes questions and case problems. "Clear and concise—a wealth of useful information."—JOURNAL OF FINANCE. *Instructor's Manual available.* 2nd Ed., 1956. 70 ills., tables; 584 pp. **\$6.00**

## **SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY**

**S. Stansfeld Sargent, Veterans Administration, Phoenix, Arizona;**

*Robert C. Williamson, Los Angeles City College*

A sound introduction to the study of human relations, this textbook incorporates new research and theory on social attitudes—their formation and mainsprings. Includes chapters on the role of cognitive processes in socialization, the phenomenon of social change and move-

ments, and the psychology of nationalism and conflict in international relations. "An excellent book—covers all the salient topics."—R. C. Kaufman, University of Arizona. *Instructor's Manual available.* 2nd Ed., 1958. 31 ills.; 649 pp. **\$6.50**

## **THE RONALD PRESS COMPANY**

15 East 26th Street, New York 10, New York

# JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL

VOLUME XXX

FEBRUARY 1960

NUMBER 6

## The Junior College in the Decade Ahead

MARVIN KNUDSON

The American Association of Junior Colleges and individual junior colleges can look forward to an exciting, challenging period of growth in stature and acceptance in the 1960's. Enrollments will double or treble, more junior colleges will be established, junior colleges will reach a new level of respectability among the people, problems of transfer will be minimized, more and more junior colleges will become accredited by their regional accrediting agencies, the American Association of Junior Colleges will become an increasingly powerful spokesman in the circles of higher education.

These things are good and we look forward to their fruition with eager anticipation. As the junior college gains in stature there will be greater interest manifested by agencies such as foundations in testing and experimenting in the development of new programs and new approaches to old programs. State and federal governments will gradually exercise more control over the operation of these programs through centralized agencies as

they provide better support for their operation. There is a danger that this control may stifle creativity and imagination in developing the kinds of programs that should be developed for the people who are going to have to face up to the problems of social responsibility in an ever shrinking world. There is a danger that these controls will be exercised by functionaries whose natural tendencies are to think in patterns of the past rather than in the realities of the present and future.

If history is any guide, this centralization of control will inevitably tighten the noose around the neck of freedom to initiate. Therefore, we must be bold in our planning while there is yet time in which to exercise this freedom. We must ask ourselves time and again, what is the junior college and what is it for? We must continuously seek the answer to this question if we are to maintain our perspective on the job we have to do. This search for truth must lead us away from mere imitation and docile followership. We must develop institutions that are truly unique in the educational programs they offer. Quality and quantity must be maintained side by side with no lack of either.

There will be a mounting pressure for the junior college to define its role. For years we have been mouthing things about the junior college and its advantages and

**Editors Note:** The Board of Directors and the Commission on Research and Service met January 15, 16, 17 in Dallas to lay plans for the next decade. President Knudson's opening statement was so excellent that, with his permission, it is included as the editorial for this issue of *Junior College Journal*.

its functions; we have been doing this for so long that these things have become platitudes repeated without even thinking whether they are true or false. We have a solemn duty to clarify the image of the junior college not only to ourselves but to and for others.

As we are able to define and clarify the role of the junior college we will be able to cope more successfully with the multifarious problems with which we will be faced in this decade. Among these problems will be one that I have already mentioned, the development of new programs adapted to meet the needs of the times and the people whom we are serving. This is no small task nor one to be undertaken lightly. It will take all the best thought and brainpower that can be mustered. Enlightened leadership is the key to this development.

The philosophy of the individual junior college will have to determine what sort of selectivity in admissions will be adopted. Many junior colleges now, taking a cue from other types of higher educational institutions, are setting up barriers to admission. Is this in harmony with the ideals of the junior college? Coupled with this is the problem of increased tuitions and fees. When do we reach the point where we cease to be the people's college and begin serving only the financially elite? What will be the result, if this occurs in our social structure?

The junior colleges will face other problems, not the least of which will be that of faculty recruitment. Salary increases alone will not provide the easy answer to finding capable dedicated men and women with the appropriate background and training necessary for the complex job ahead. Increased costs of

operation and the need for providing physical facilities to care for the increasing numbers of students will present stupendous problems and are even now eroding away the concept of local control.

A new emphasis on efficiency in educational endeavor suggests the possibility of even larger class size and teaching by robots. Are we going to answer these suggestions by quoting ancient shibboleths or are we going to marshall the facts gathered by serious study and apply them to the problems of the improvement of instruction? Your officers and directors are now in the process of attempting to define a problem for the study of increasing the efficiency of the instructional processes that will help find answers to these questions. It is hoped that one of the large foundations will be agreeable to financing such a program.

The pattern of organization for administration of junior colleges is as varied and as confusing as can be found in any social organization. Serious study must be given to this problem on a grand scale. Again we find that the American Association of Junior Colleges is concerned and has been given a substantial grant of money to educate administrators and study the problems of junior college administration.

What of the American Association of Junior Colleges in this decade? If it is to be a significant force in the development of the junior college movement it must be so through leadership. The American Association of Junior Colleges will gain in prestige and influence as it makes its leadership felt. How and in what areas will this leadership be made available?

As an illustration, junior colleges have properly been concerned with the neces-

sity for broadening the concept of what can legitimately be called education beyond the high school. Yet we continue to talk about degree courses and non-degree courses. We still continue to offer Associate in Arts degrees in the traditional subjects but often fail to grant degrees in other areas although we often do give diplomas for completion of some non-traditional programs. I am sure that the American Association of Junior Colleges can make its influence felt in this whole area of broadening the concept of education beyond the high school.

General education is another area in which there is much confusion and misunderstanding. Usually it is something that seems to be opposed to vocationalism. The leadership of the American Association of Junior Colleges can do much to clarify the confused thinking in this and many other areas of paramount importance to our educational thinking by stressing such matters in our publications, designing programs of discussion about them and by encouraging study of these problems and disseminating the information.

As a means of implementing the policies adopted I would like to borrow from the pages of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and suggest the formation of a field service council of the American Association of Junior Colleges. This council should be composed of experienced junior college men and women, strategically placed throughout the United States, who would be willing to

act as consultants on call to existing junior colleges, or to areas wishing to organize new junior college districts.

Seminars and training sessions for the members of the field service council could be arranged either at one of the junior colleges or, if need be, on some university campus. The more one thinks of the possibilities of this type of thing the greater the opportunities seem to be for providing a much needed service that will strengthen every phase of the junior college movement. At the same time it would serve to strengthen the role of the American Association of Junior Colleges.

A second undertaking for the American Association of Junior Colleges Board of Directors is development of some authoritative statements of philosophy which will clarify the image of the junior college function and role for the public, and for the junior college people themselves. This effort might well be a continuing function of a special committee of the American Association of Junior Colleges.

I look forward to the next decade with an enthusiastic optimism tempered with a caution born of a knowledge that our diversity coupled with the impending pressures of enrollment may result in a concept of the junior college too nebulous to grasp. We stand on the threshold of the greatest opportunity ever faced by an educational organization. God grant that we have the vision and leadership to be wise in our efforts.

## Recent State Legislation Affecting Junior Colleges

S. V. MARTORANA

THIS ARTICLE and another to appear in the March, 1960, issue of the *Junior College Journal* will report the seventh biennial survey of state legislative action affecting the community-junior college level of American education. Only laws which were passed by 1958 or 1959 legislatures will be examined here, while the second article will be concerned with legislation considered during the same period which failed to become law. Such surveys have periodically been reported in publications prepared under the auspices of the American Association of Junior Colleges.<sup>1</sup>

Although the earlier studies were conducted entirely as a service of the AAJC and its Committee on Legislation, beginning with 1956 the surveys have been completed under the cooperative auspices of the AAJC and the Federal Office of Education. In 1957 the Office of Education initiated an annual compilation of state legislative enactments pertaining to all aspects of higher education, including the community-junior college level. Legislation for that level as reported in the annual compilation for 1958 and from pre-publication material for the 1959 compilation has been used as the basic

data source for this article. For further details regarding any legislation and the reference numbers of the enactments, the full Office of Education report may be consulted.<sup>2</sup>

Most of the legislation reported herein was passed during the 1959 legislative sessions, since comparatively few sessions are held in the even-numbered years. Acts appropriating money for state aid to be distributed to the junior colleges are not included unless a change in the basic procedures for allocation of aid was made. In addition to presenting sum-

<sup>1</sup> See for example:

Hugh G. Price, "Recent Junior College Legislation in Various States," *Junior College Journal*, XVIII, 438-443.

S. V. Martorana, "Recent State Legislation Affecting Junior Colleges," *Junior College Journal*, XX, 241-252; and XXIV, 459-471; and XXVI, 328-341; and XXVIII, 307-321.

S. V. Martorana, "The Legal Status of American Public Junior Colleges," *American Junior Colleges*, ed. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr. (5th ed.; Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, to be published in 1960).

<sup>2</sup> E. V. Hollis, William G. Land, and S. V. Martorana, *Survey of State Legislation Relating to Higher Education*, July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1958, Circular No. 552, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Division of Higher Education (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1959); and July 1, 1958, to December 31, 1959, to be published in 1960.

---

S. V. MARTORANA is Chief, State and Regional Organization, Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

maries of legislative action in the various states, this article will attempt to take note of changes and trends in the junior college area.

As is customary in the preparation of the studies in this series, data for the report were gathered by direct communication with official agencies such as state departments of education, secretaries of state, and the state boards of higher education. Replies to requests for information were received from all of the 50 states and the territories. In addition to studying the documents of legislation from the various states, direct correspondence with officials and agencies was used to secure certain needed information and interpretation. Moreover, in some cases junior college administrators were requested to express their reactions to legislation affecting their institutions.

#### EXTENT OF LEGISLATIVE ACTION

Forty states and Guam considered legislative proposals bearing on the community or junior college level during the period of this report. This figure includes four states which had legislation introduced that failed to become law and 36 states which enacted laws influencing the junior college level. It also includes three states which each passed only a law concerned with a statewide survey of all higher education: Missouri, New Mexico, and Ohio. Among the 36 states which enacted laws were 22 which introduced other legislation regarding junior colleges that was not approved. Guam approved a bill in 1958 and revised it in 1959. These figures reflect approximately the same amount of interest in junior college legislation as was described in this periodical for the previous biennium; 38 states had

considered such legislation and 35 had enacted pertinent laws.<sup>3</sup>

#### LEGISLATION ENACTED

A summary of the positive action of each state legislature with regard to junior colleges is presented in this section. Although the summaries are necessarily brief, sufficient data have been included to illustrate the type and scope of legislation approved. Further information may be secured from any one of the states by communication with its state department of public instruction or its secretary of state.

*Alabama* created the Alabama Education Commission and empowered it to make a general survey of the existing educational system and the financial needs of public education for a 10-year period, to be reported to the legislature in January, 1959. The scope of the survey specifically included colleges, universities, graduate and extension courses, and normal or teachers schools; existing and proposed institutions were to be considered. The Commission was to consist of 21 members and provision was made for staff assistance, with an appropriation of \$50,000. A second act established the Alabama Education Authority with power to provide for construction, remodeling, and equipment of college buildings, and to issue refunding bonds, \$23,564,600 of which is to be allocated to higher education institutions, including the Mobile Branch of Alabama State College. The state granted permission to the city of Jasper to convey land to Walker College, an incorporated two-year institution.

<sup>3</sup> S. V. Martorana, "Recent State Legislation Affecting Junior Colleges," *Junior College Journal*, XXVIII, 308.

*Arizona*, in a bill specifically concerned with junior colleges, established a Junior College Survey Committee to make a survey relative to the establishment, curriculum, financing, and location of junior colleges, and to their coordination with high schools, colleges and universities. The committee was to be composed of 12 members, half of whom were to be educators and half, state legislators. A report with specific recommendations regarding the state's needs for junior colleges and the means of best meeting the needs for higher education in the state was to have been completed by December, 1958.

*California* passed 16 laws concerned specifically with junior colleges. Three other legislative items included the junior colleges in the scope of their authority: (1) a resolution requesting the liaison committee of the State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California to prepare a master plan for the development, expansion, and integration of the facilities, curriculums, and standards of higher education in the state to meet the needs of the next 10 years and thereafter; (2) a resolution urging groups engaged in promoting California industry to advertise the capabilities of its institutions of higher education in supplying professional, scientific, and technical manpower; and (3) a bill providing up to \$50 monthly assistance for living expenses to students above high school level who are children of deceased or disabled war veterans but ineligible to receive duplicate benefits from any other governmental source.

Seven of the 16 laws pertained to junior college districts and related financing. One provided for an increase in the maximum tax rate of a junior college dis-

trict or a unified school district which maintains a junior college, not to exceed the county tax rate of the previous year or ten mills, whichever may be greater. A second validated for tax purposes the formation of junior college districts established before February, 1959. A third bill eliminated obsolete references to prior fiscal years and clarified changes in the provisions relating to average daily attendance totals to be used for computing basic state aid and foundation programs for junior college districts. A fourth, the "First Validating Act of 1958," approved the organization, boundaries, acts, proceedings, and bonds of public bodies, and specifically those of junior college districts. The remaining three bills provided for election procedures for the formation of a junior college district; for the procedure whereby a junior college district may be annexed to a contiguous junior college district; and for state aid to a county during the first year any part of it is included in a district maintaining a junior college.

Four bills concerning maintenance of classes and student admissions authorized the following: (1) the offering of junior college classes outside the school district if such activities offer opportunity to students residing in the district and under certain other conditions; (2) the admission of 12th grade students into junior college courses for credit as special part-time students upon recommendation of the school principal, with certain limitations; (3) the admission of non-resident students to junior colleges maintained by districts, specifying contractual arrangements and determination of costs; and (4) the admission of minors to evening high schools and evening junior colleges.

Two bills concerned diplomas: the first permitted the Superintendent of Public Instruction to grant permission to private teachers and schools on a year-to-year basis for their issuance of specified diplomas evidencing completion of courses beyond high school level; the second exempted certificates of business and professional in-service training courses from the provisions relating to the issuance of diplomas.

The remaining three items covered diverse areas: (1) defining of public agency as including a junior college for purposes of the State Employees Retirement Law; (2) establishing a degree requiring not less than one year of post-graduate study as the minimum standard credential for teaching in a public junior college; and (3) requesting Congress to enact legislation to continue support to area vocational education in high schools and in technical divisions of junior colleges.

Concern with further establishment of state colleges was shown in authorization for the establishment of Stanislaus State College and authorization of study as to the need for a state college in the North Bay area. Moreover, 12 bills proposing establishment of state colleges were introduced but failed to pass.

*Colorado* amended its existing law to provide for the formation of a junior college district composed of more than one public school district and for the establishment of a system of director districts if the junior college district shall consist of more than one county. In a bill providing for a system of planning for the executive budget capital construction projects, applicable to all state departments, capital construction projects of

junior colleges involving state funds were specifically included; however, state aid for junior college buildings in Colorado has not yet been authorized.

Study of Colorado's higher education needs was provided in a 1958 resolution directing the Legislative Council to appoint a joint legislative committee of nine members and a lay advisory committee to study together education beyond the high school (\$20,000 appropriation); and in a bill creating a similar committee appointed by the Legislative Council for the same purpose but including *all* levels of education.

*Connecticut* authorized the board of education of a town, upon approval of a referendum, to maintain a post-secondary school or schools of college grade which meet the requirements of the State Board of Education, charging resident tuition not to exceed the costs of instruction and administration and non-resident tuition to include the per pupil costs of operation and maintenance. The state also amended existing law to provide for additions to the sites of any state teachers college, vocational school, or technical institute. An approved bond issue included provision for \$250,000 for site acquisition and plans for a technical institute at Waterbury.

*Florida*, in its 1959 General Appropriations Act, included \$400,000 for assisting four proposed junior colleges during 1960-61. The state also passed four laws giving recognition to its junior colleges and generally increasing their status: (1) a bill amending existing law by adding junior colleges to the list of public institutions in which teaching services may be performed as recompense for scholarships; (2) a bill providing that junior college em-

ployees on continuing contract in a county participating in the support of a junior college shall revert to continuing county contract status if not reappointed in the junior college during the first three years of employment; (3) a bill reconstituting the membership of the Florida Teacher Education Advisory Council by specifying certain categories to be represented, including teacher training institutions and junior colleges; and (4) a bill adding the libraries of junior colleges to those designated as depositories for copies of Florida statutes.

*Georgia* enacted two bills in conjunction which authorized various political subdivisions of the state to establish colleges including junior colleges, and to levy taxes for college purposes. Further provisions of one of the bills included state aid of \$300 per academic year per full-time equivalent student and stipulated that no other direct financial contribution may be made by the state; no junior college established under this act shall be a unit of the University System. As yet there is no two-year college in Georgia under this plan. All have chosen to be under the jurisdiction of the Regents of the University System of Georgia.

On the subject of higher education surveys, a resolution authorized a study of the University System for promulgating its findings to the General Assembly. Another resolution created a committee to study the effectiveness of high school training in preparing students for entering the University System of Georgia or other colleges, the relationship of college entrance requirements to current high school training, and the availability of college training to all high school graduates. The committee report was to have

been submitted by January 20, 1960. Another act included the Board of Trustees of Georgia Military College in the coverage of state officers and employees under the provisions of the Federal Social Security Act.

*Idaho* amended its law relating to retirement contributions by school and junior college districts in order to correct an inequity arising from the imposition of a one-half mill tax levied on junior college districts in addition to the combined one-mill county and school district tax. It also authorized junior college districts, to sell, rent, or lease, with or without compensation, real or personal property to non-profit educational corporations, including other school districts and junior college housing commissions.

*Illinois* joined the list of states which have authorized autonomous junior college districts by revising its school code so as to provide that any contiguous and compact territory having no part within a school district maintaining a junior college (unless all such district is included) and having a population of not less than 30,000 and not more than 500,000 and an assessed valuation of not less than \$75,000,000, may be organized into a junior college district; provisions are included for organization procedures and for contractual relationships of junior college teachers.

A further enactment requires a public junior college student to pay a portion of the cost of his tuition, not to exceed one-third of the per capita cost of maintaining the college.

Having indirect bearing on the junior colleges is the amendment of the law relating to the Illinois Commission of Higher Education which directs the Com-

mission to recommend by April 1, 1961, a plan for the unified administration of all state-controlled institutions of higher education.

*Iowa* passed two laws relating to junior colleges, one allowing them to be known as community colleges as well as junior colleges, and the other appropriating \$12,500 to the Legislative Research Bureau for a comprehensive study of the needs and facilities available for higher education in the state. An advisory committee is to submit a report on the study by January 15, 1961.

*Kansas* took a step toward regional junior colleges by enacting a law to establish a county junior college in a county in which a rural high school district is maintaining a high school extension course. Institutional control resides in a board of regents of six members, three elected and three from the rural high school board. Courses of study are to be prescribed by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The bill also provided for a county property tax of one and one-half mills for the support of the junior college.

*Louisiana* appropriated \$650,000 to Louisiana State University to expand its facilities by establishing a two-year campus at Chambers, provided that Congress has authorized using for general education purposes certain lands granted to the state for agricultural and vocational training; it was specified that the Chambers facilities are not to be expanded to more than those suitable for a two-year commuter college, unless such expansion is approved by the electorate.

A constitutional amendment proposing to make the Metropolitan Commuter's College an integral part of Louisiana

State University was submitted to public vote in the November, 1958, election and approved.

Legislation was passed to make a permanent interim committee of the joint legislative committee to study higher education. A constitutional amendment was proposed to give the legislature authority to make provisions for, among other alternatives, an educational system including all public schools and all institutions of learning operated by state agencies.

*Maine* granted Thomas Junior College the power to confer the degrees of Associate in Arts and Associate in Secretarial Science, by appropriate action of its trustees.

*Maryland* passed a single law which included a junior college in its coverage: an amendment to existing law which removes registrars and librarians on the staffs of the state teachers colleges, St. Mary's Seminary Junior College, Morgan State College, and the University of Maryland from classified employee status.

*Massachusetts* in 1958 established in the Department of Education, but not subject to its control, a Massachusetts Board of Regional Community Colleges composed of 15 members. The Board is charged with determining the need for education at the community and junior college level; developing an overall plan; establishment, maintenance, and supervision of regional community colleges, including the making of agreements with local authorities; and selection of curriculums including professional and vocational areas, and of programs of adult education. Each regional community college is to have an advisory board of 10 members appointed by the Governor. After January 1, 1959, no city or town

may establish a local public junior college; however, existing colleges of this type will continue. A bill enacted after June 30, 1957, had provided for the continuance of a special commission established in 1956 to make further study of the operation and structure of junior or community colleges.

Another bill authorized a city or town to use the designation "junior college" with respect to an extended course of instruction at a particular school and also approved the granting of certain degrees subject to the approval of the board of collegiate authority. Two junior colleges had bills aimed specifically toward them: one enabling Bradford Junior College to hold a larger amount of real and personal property and the other creating a commission to study the possibility of obtaining additional support for the Franklin Technical Institute from the trust fund bequeathed by Benjamin Franklin.

A program affecting the state's junior colleges was inaugurated in the passage of a scholarship bill which empowered a Board of Educational Assistance (11 members) to administer scholarship awards. Not less than one per cent nor more than 25 per cent of the number awarded in any one year shall be allotted to students in state-supported institutions.

*Michigan* repealed a 1948 law establishing county normal schools. It amended the law relating to community college districts so as to permit two or more school districts which operate kindergarten through grade 12 programs within a county or contiguous counties to join together to form a community college district. Thus, junior colleges may now be supported and controlled in Michigan by groups of local public school districts

as well as by groups of contiguous counties. The latter control has been authorized since 1955.

*Minnesota* revised its state aid system to provide that the first year of aid to junior colleges established after April 27, 1957, shall be paid on the basis of the enrollments at the end of the second week of operation. Another bill requested that the Regents of the University of Minnesota consider the establishment of college courses at the schools and experiment stations at Morris and Crookston, which have been operated by the University on a high school level. A third bill requested the State College Board, the Board of Regents, and the State Board of Education to create a liaison committee for educational planning and coordination of public higher education.

*Mississippi* increased the per diem payment allowed to junior college trustees from \$5 to \$10 per meeting and provided a mileage allowance for travel. Another act authorized the State Building Commission to issue bonds totaling \$6,400,000 for construction and renovation of buildings at state educational institutions. Included among its provisions was an allotment of \$100,000 to each of 16 public junior colleges for such purposes.

Two other laws concerned state powers with regard to all levels of education: one empowered the Governor to close in the public interest any school, junior college, or institution of higher learning; the other authorized the Attorney-General to represent any school officer or employee in a state or federal action seeking to invalidate a state school law.

*Missouri* created a State Commission on Higher Education of 12 appointive members to study the organization and

administration of higher education in the state, including an analysis of the administrative, financial, academic, and personnel programs of the several state institutions, and to recommend plans for improvement, including the advisability of establishing a state coordinating or supervisory board. A report was to have been made by January 1, 1959.

*Nebraska* passed two pieces of legislation amending the laws relating to the powers of the Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska and of the Board of Education of State Normal Schools, respectively. In each case the board was empowered to provide for holding classes at various localities throughout the state through an extension division, and was charged to avoid unnecessary duplication of courses offered by other institutions at such localities. Another bill changed the name of the Nebraska State Trade School to the Nebraska Vocational Technical School.

*New Jersey* established a Higher Education Assistance Authority in the Department of Education to assist students in financial need in obtaining loans enabling them to attend college. Two scholarship acts were passed: one created a State Scholarship Commission and regulations as to awarding of scholarships, including a number amounting to five per cent of the total high school graduates for the previous year and a stipulation that the college be in New Jersey; an amending act defined the colleges more closely and permitted attendance at out-of-state colleges under certain conditions. Also the state passed a resolution congratulating Union Junior College on its 25th anniversary.

*New Mexico* directed its Legislative

Finance Committee to conduct a thorough study of the necessity of providing additional educational institutions or the extension of existing institutions for education beyond the 12th grade of public school, including methods by which they can be financed and including consideration of the effect of possible federal legislation on aid to education.

*New York* passed four laws concerned with various aspects of community college operation. One provided that a board of trustees of a community college may enter into contracts, without obtaining bids, for the operation of the college, including contracts with non-profit corporations organized by officers, students, or alumni for that purpose. A second bill amended the law relating to salary scales in institutions under the Board of Higher Education in the city of New York so as to exclude from its provisions the community colleges sponsored or administered by that board. A third amended the law relating to the duties of the president of the University of the State of New York so as to allow delegation of authority with reference to the certification of amounts payable to community colleges by the counties. The fourth bill concerned a particular college and was an amendment providing that vacancies on the Board of Trustees of the New York City Community College of Applied Arts and Sciences shall be filled by the mayor.

A fifth law provided state aid to municipal colleges in the city of New York, except for community colleges, on the basis of one-sixth of the current operating cost of educating students enrolled in the first two years of undergraduate study.

*North Carolina* legislation consisted of two laws bearing indirectly on the junior

colleges. One amended the law relating to the powers of the State Board of Higher Education (which coordinates all public post-high school institutions) with relation to the discontinuance of existing facilities and functions; it also provided that the Board shall review and appraise the biennial budget requests of all institutions and make recommendations to the Director of the Budget and the Advisory Budget Commission, advising whether the budget requests of each institution are consistent with its primary purpose as allocated to it by statute or by the Board. The other law concerned curriculum and directed "that increasing emphasis in the curriculums of all state institutions of higher learning shall be placed upon the pursuit of knowledge and the disciplines of the mind"; it further sought to establish basic minimum standards below which no institution shall fall and empowered the trustees of each institution to implement the act progressively by appropriate measures.

*Ohio* in 1959 created an Interim Commission on Education Beyond the High School in the Department of Industrial and Economic Development to consist of nine members appointed by the Governor. Among the duties of the Commission are: (1) to cooperate with the State Board of Education to integrate secondary education with education beyond the high school and establish closer ties between high schools and colleges; (2) to conduct studies concerning the needs for technical institutes, community and junior colleges and university branches; (3) to conduct studies of laws and policies governing admission to state-supported colleges and universities; and (4) to con-

duct studies of financial need and possible state aid to municipal universities.

*Oklahoma* requested the executive committee of the State Legislative Council to appoint a special committee of nine members of the House of Representatives and four members of the Senate to codify and revise all state laws pertaining to higher education. Another act established a merit system of personnel administration but exempted officers and employees of the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education from its coverage. A third act provided for centralized purchasing by the state but included among its purchase exemptions those made by the State System of Higher Education and units thereof relating to textbooks, laboratory supplies, and instructional material.

*Oregon* revised and amended the law relating to junior colleges so that education centers or community colleges may be established by school districts having more than 100,000 inhabitants and by area education districts having certain resources. Included in the bill was a provision for contracts to be made by a school district with the General Extension Division of the State Board of Higher Education for operating lower division collegiate grade classes in the local district. Three other laws concerned the Oregon Technical Institute: One transferred its control and operation from the State Board of Education to the State Board of Higher Education and established it as a separate department in the higher educational system, to be effective July 1, 1960, and provided for relocation of the institution at Klamath Falls within five years; another bill authorized the State Board of Education or its successors to grant easements across lands

now occupied by the Oregon Technical Institute; the third provided for the leasing of the property of Oregon Technical Institute which is not needed for educational purposes, subject to the terms and restrictions of its conveyance, to the state from the federal government as surplus property.

In addition, the state created a State Scholarship Commission to administer scholarships previously administered by a committee of the State Board of Higher Education; a further provision extended applicability of scholarships to all institutions which may come under the jurisdiction of that board.

*Rhode Island* considered the matter of establishing two-year colleges, placed them administratively under the Board of Trustees of State Colleges, and directed the Board to survey the need for these institutions and to report proposals for the establishment of one or more, including location, physical facilities, and budgets. Two other bills concerned a survey of future needs of higher education in the state: one continued the commission already authorized for that purpose and the other commended the commission's report.

*South Carolina* passed three laws, each of which created a county commission for higher education with power to contract with institutions of higher learning for establishing a two-year institution. The first created the Lancaster County Commission and authorized standard freshman and sophomore courses and such courses as deemed desirable; it also empowered the Commission to establish admission standards. The second law created the Horry County Higher Education Commission, to include the officers of the

Coastal Education Foundation, Inc., and authorized it to issue bonds based on the proceeds of a three-mill property tax in that county. The third law created the Beaufort County Higher Education Commission.

*Texas* passed eleven laws directly concerned with junior colleges. One provided that the Central Education Agency shall exercise general control of the public junior colleges of the state and that the State Department of Education shall have the responsibility of adopting policies and enacting regulations for carrying out the duties placed upon it, or upon the Central Education Agency, by the legislature.

Seven bills were related to junior college districts: (1) an amendment authorizing the issuance of bonds and notes by junior college districts by declaring them to be authorized investments and making them eligible to secure the deposit of public funds; (2) an amendment relating to the establishment of junior colleges, allowing the State Board of Education to waive the 5,000 minimum enrollment requirement for proposed districts having a taxable property evaluation of \$1,000,000 or more; (3) an amendment providing for creation of union junior college districts where there are two or more contiguous independent or common school districts with a combined taxable wealth of \$5,500,000 and a school population of 7,000 with not less than 400 high school seniors; (4) a bill authorizing the holding of joint elections for members of county boards, of school trustees, or of governing boards of any junior college district, regional college district, or other type of college district; (5) an act validating the organization and actions of

boards of regents of junior college districts, except any which may have been involved in litigation within 30 days of the effective date of the act; (6) an act awarding to regional college districts the power of eminent domain for acquiring lands and buildings; and (7) an act changing the name of the Hockley County Junior College District to the South Plains Junior College District.

Two pieces of legislation changed the status of former two-year colleges, Arlington State College and Tarleton State College, respectively, to that of four-year colleges. In the case of Tarleton State College, authorization is given for continuance of the two-year program; and for Arlington State College continuation of instruction in the vocational certificate program is authorized.

A resolution requested the Commission on Higher Education to survey and reappraise the advisability of legislation at the next session empowering the board of regents of Corpus Christi Junior College (Del Mar College) to submit to the voters of that district the question of whether or not it should offer junior and senior college work in limited fields.

*Utah* enacted two laws requesting the Coordinating Council of Higher Education to study the feasibility of establishing a vocational school at Juul and a junior college at Nephi, respectively. A third law provided for the establishment of a junior college at Roosevelt upon the acceptance of a suitable site, to begin in 1962-63 with a program of vocational and technical training. In two additional laws, Carbon College became a branch of the University of Utah on July 1, 1959, and Weber College was empowered to

expand to a four-year college between 1962 and 1964.

A bill increased the authority of the State Board of Education to accept loans, grants, gifts, or requests for institutions under its control (formerly limited to junior colleges), to include all institutions.

Utah also established a Coordinating Council of Higher Education to exercise leadership in coordinating post-high school institutions, including separately operated vocational schools. The Council is composed of nine unpaid members; its duties include establishment of uniform statistical and financial reporting systems and establishment of criteria for budget needs, programs, methods, admissions, and plant utilization.

An amendment regarding scholarships provided that teacher-training scholarships at Utah State University and at Carbon College, Dixie College, Snow College, and Weber College (the latter four, two-year institutions) shall be equal to the tuition fee.

*Virginia* established two existing branches of the College of William and Mary, one in Norfolk and one in Richmond, as legally integral divisions of the College. It also created in Roanoke a division of Virginia Polytechnic Institute for the training of industrial technicians. Clinch Valley College and the Northern Virginia Branch College were made divisions of the University of Virginia and integral parts thereof in an additional legislative item. Study of tuition charges at state educational institutions by a legislative commission of seven members was authorized.

The state enacted a bill directing the Council of Higher Education, among

other things, to make a survey of demands on higher education in various areas, including consideration of plans for branch schools and community colleges. A bill applying specifically to one junior college authorized the school board of Dickenson County to purchase and operate a bus for the transportation of students to Clinch Valley College.

*Washington* created in 1959 a joint legislative committee on education to study facts and matters relating to education in the state, including education beyond the high school and implications of enrollment forecasts. Another act amended the law relating to the State Board of Education so as to require annual reports to the Governor and the Legislative Budget Committee on enrollment forecasts of all public and private schools, including colleges and universities. A third enactment provided for sick leave for teachers under contract to school districts, covering junior colleges whenever operated by such districts.

*West Virginia* established minimum and maximum tuition fees at state institutions of higher education. In addition, the bill provided for a registration fee of \$50 to be charged at all institutions, with a proportional amount for summer school; one-third of the income from these fees is to be deposited in the general fund and two-thirds in a capital improvements fund for West Virginia University (including the two-year institution Potomac State College) and the state teachers colleges.

*Wisconsin* increased the salary range at its county teachers colleges (two-year institutions) to \$4,500-\$6,950 (formerly \$3,800-\$6,000). It amended the law relating to non-resident tuition at county

teachers colleges and provided that tuition of a non-resident student from a county maintaining a county teachers college shall not be charged against the county of residence. A third enactment amended the law relating to county and city indebtedness so as to authorize borrowing for constructing and *maintaining* a county or city building for any one of various purposes, including that of a University of Wisconsin Extension Center if its operation has been approved by the University Board of Regents. (Previous legislation had allowed indebtedness only for construction purposes.)

*Wyoming* defined higher education as including college level academic programs and programs of terminal and vocational education in community and junior colleges. The act designated the Community College Commission as the state agency for the distribution of state aid to community colleges and provided that the Board of Trustees of the University of Wyoming and the Commission together shall formulate policies for higher education in the community colleges. State aid funds were provided and a formula for their distribution. The bill included an appropriation of \$400,000 to be used by the Community College Commission, \$300,000 to be distributed at the rate of \$10,000 per college per year, plus a pro rata amount of half the remainder, and \$100,000 to be held for distribution to any additional junior colleges becoming eligible in the next biennium, in the same manner.

The state also passed a law authorizing governing boards of school districts and community colleges having a day enrollment of not less than 200 students to issue 40-year six per cent revenue bonds

for acquiring, erecting, and equipping student dormitories and dining halls and for their sites.

Two items of legislation concerned a student loan plan. One established the Wyoming Higher Education Loan Plan whereby the state guarantees 80 per cent of the amount of a bank loan up to \$500, which may be granted to a student who has completed one-half year of higher education. The other law made an appropriation of \$50,000 to be known as the Wyoming Higher Education Loan Fund for the financing of the Loan Plan.

A fifth law established teacher-training scholarships of \$250 annually, tenable at the University of Wyoming or any accredited junior or community college in Wyoming.

*Guam* in 1958 approved two-year scholarships to the Territorial College of Guam for graduates having highest standing in each of the private and public high schools of Guam, and in the same law established a Scholarship and Student Loan Fund. In 1959 this law was repealed and a similar bill passed, which established scholarships to attend the Territorial College of Guam and provided further scholarships for graduates of the Territorial College, to be used in the U. S. or its territories. A specified number of professional scholarships was provided. This law also included a student loan fund, and it offered a plan for cancellation of loans by government service.

#### CONCLUSION: LEGAL STATUS OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

The current study of junior college legislation encompasses a considerable portion of the legislation affecting all higher education. This means that the

junior colleges have come a long way since their inception. Much of the legislation is general in character and illustrates the trend toward recognition of the junior college system as a separate level of American education; other legislation is specific, applying to restricted institutions of a junior college type or to particular governmental units which control or support them.

Sixteen states called for studies and surveys of their higher education systems, continuing the current concern with planning for future needs in education. Most of these were general in scope; however, Ohio (which state presently has no public junior colleges) specifically asked its Commission on Education Beyond the High School to conduct studies as to the need for technical institutes, community and junior colleges, and university branches. Arizona, Connecticut, Georgia, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island authorized surveys confined to the junior college level.

About one-third of the states enacting laws modified their prior legislation regarding the establishment of two-year institutions. Connecticut and Georgia passed their first general enabling legislation for junior colleges. Connecticut authorized a town board of education, upon approval of a referendum, to maintain a post-secondary school meeting the requirements of the State Board of Education. Georgia approved the establishment of colleges, including junior colleges, by various political subdivisions of the state, and the levying of taxes for such purposes; however, to date all public two-year colleges (except two military junior colleges) have elected to operate under the Regents of the University Sys-

tem of Georgia. State aid of \$300 per year per student was provided in the Georgia legislation. South Carolina passed three individual bills authorizing in each case the establishment of a two-year branch of an existing institution.

Problems of district organization continue to plague the development of community-junior colleges in the United States. The establishment and regulation of junior college districts were the subject of seven laws each for California and Texas. Six other states approved regulations concerning junior college districts. Varied requirements are shown in new regulations as to population and assessed valuation. Illinois, in a law relative to organizing a junior college district, specified a population range of 30,000 to 500,000 and a valuation of \$75,000,000. Oregon authorized "education centers or community colleges" in school districts having more than 100,000 inhabitants. Texas allowed the State Board of Education to waive its 5,000 minimum enrollment requirement for proposed districts having a taxable property evaluation of \$1,000,000 or more and also created *union* junior college districts of two or more contiguous common school districts with a combined taxable wealth of \$5,-500,000 and a school population of 7,000 with not less than 400 high school seniors.

Many legislative enactments reveal the response of the legislatures to the dynamic growth of the two-year colleges. In addition to the previously mentioned general enabling legislation of Connecticut and Georgia, California allowed junior college offerings outside the district in certain instances; Massachusetts permitted use of the designation "junior college" with respect to an extended

course of instruction; and Utah established one new junior college and is studying the feasibility of two additional locations. Oregon made the Oregon Technical Institute a separate *department* in the higher education system.

An increasing interest on the part of state universities in establishing branches and centers is evident in several enactments. Louisiana made the Metropolitan Commuter's College an integral part of Louisiana State University. Minnesota requested consideration of offering college courses at certain schools and experiment stations then operating on high school level. Nebraska authorized two of its state boards to provide for classes at various localities through extension divisions. Utah changed a two-year institution to a university branch. Virginia in two cases established two college branches as integral divisions of a college and created a division of a third college.

Several more community-junior colleges changed from two-year to four-year status during 1958-59, among them the Metropolitan Commuter's College which was made a part of Louisiana State University. Texas changed two former two-year institutions to four-year colleges and is considering the same change with respect to another junior college. Utah also expanded a junior college to a four-year institution.

Progress in a few states with regard to state aid legislation will be welcomed by persons concerned with junior college operation. Georgia's \$300 per person per year has been noted. California amended its law to provide state aid during the first year any part of a county is included in a district maintaining a junior college. Kansas included a property tax of one

and one-half mills for support of the junior colleges it authorized. Minnesota revised its state aid to the effect that it will be paid on the basis of a junior college enrollment at the end of the second week of operation. Wisconsin amended a law to include *maintenance* of a University of Wisconsin extension center as justification for county or city indebtedness. Wyoming provided state aid and a formula for distribution by its Community College Commission. It is interesting to note that New York enacted state aid to the lower division level of four-year colleges in the city of New York, to be provided in the same manner but in a lesser amount than that for community colleges.

A few enactments were identified during 1958-1959 which provided financial aid for physical plants and facilities, for example, in the states of Alabama and Mississippi. These indicate reaction to growing pressures in the financing of these institutions.

There appears to be an increasing consciousness of the responsibility to make education possible for the local student, as will be seen in the several acts concerning scholarships and loans. Offsetting some of the gain in this area is the authorization of tuition fees, such as in Illinois.

Certain laws are seen to add stature and to bring recognition for the junior college as a part of the state educational enterprise. Laws establishing the status of the junior college staff members with regard to state personnel policies, their eligibility for social security, and similar legislation are noted.

As a general rule, legislatures are reluctant to invade the areas of program

and curriculum in higher institutions. This reluctance has been observed consistently in this series of studies. In view of this fact, the laws designed to advance technical training in the community-junior colleges of California, Connecticut, and Utah are of special interest.

Legislators, as the elected representatives of the people, have a dual role of responsibility in advancing education. On the one hand, they are expected to assist in providing support of public institutions. On the other, they act as the spokesmen of the general electorate, reflecting in proposals for legislation either public support or dissatisfaction with the educational services available in a state.

If this concept is valid, the American Association of Junior Colleges, its special Committee on Legislation, and workers in community-junior colleges generally might well ask some questions concerning the implications shown by the status of and trends in legislation. Such questions might be: Why is state aid for capital facilities for community-junior colleges progressing very slowly? What can be done by the institutions and the high schools to overcome weaknesses in district

nization when these are a part of the historical evolution of community-junior colleges in a state? Why is there growing legislative activity in creating branches and extension centers of state colleges and universities? Why are some two-year colleges being converted to four-year colleges by their state legislatures? A co-operative quest for answers to questions such as these may well lead to a stronger Association, improved legislative programs and—most important of all—strengthened and expanded services to the public by the community-junior colleges.

## Good Community Relations Help the Small College Library Grow

A. H. GRIFFING

THAT A DOLLAR saved is a dollar that can be spent for something else no one knows better than those responsible for the growth of the library in the small private junior college. Unless an oil well unexpectedly comes in through the floor of the main reading room, the library in such a college must make every dollar go as far as possible, and then make it go even a little further. With rising costs this becomes increasingly difficult.

This is where community relations come in, especially in the case of the relatively new institution which is upgrading its facilities on all fronts at the same time. In the library, this means buying current material, buying "backwards," and providing at least adequate minimums in the reference field. It is in the matter of buying "backwards" that the community can give the most help, but its aid is certainly not limited to that.

There are many persons and families in a community that buy good books of lasting worth. Many more take periodicals, and some save the successive issues and have accumulations dating back quite a number of years. Some of these are professional people, or they have special in-

terests and acquire periodicals and books which may fill important gaps in a junior college library, providing the books and periodical accumulations find their way to the college instead of being given away elsewhere or sold for waste. Acquiring this material is the responsibility of the college itself, and it is not a matter of gimmicks but of developing good community relations and making a well-disposed public conscious of the college library.

Experience in the past few years at Maunaolu College is convincing evidence that substantial help for the library of a small private college can be expected from a community which is informed of (but not badgered about) the needs of the library. One small article in the local paper reporting progress toward one of the intermediate goals brought a substantial check from a local citizen which helped reach that goal. An informal chat produced complete files of several periodicals for two and one-half to five years back. Small news items about the progress of the library in releases sent to alumni resulted in gifts from the still very young and new graduates.

Upon leaving the community, several families permitted the librarian to comb their bookshelves for books that the college could use. Other families clear their

---

A. H. GRIFFING is Assistant Professor of English and Librarian of Maunaolu College, Paia, Maui, Hawaii.

shelves occasionally and send boxes of books. A lawyer who was also a legislator furnished the revised laws of the Territory (now state) plus other papers and documents to add to the special files on Hawaii.

Some readers will already be saying, "But what do you do with all those older books you must get?" "Surely you can't use all of them." True, but sometimes the public library can use them, or in special instances they are sent to Asian students. Some books can be used to fill emergency needs: Recently a local high school lost almost its entire library by fire. Maunaolu College has been able to assist in rebuilding the book collection and is still sending the school duplicate copies of periodicals it receives. This type of arrangement is reciprocal: The college has received books from institutions with which it has shared. When duplicate books accumulate to the point where there is no space for them or when they are not suitable for other institutions, they are put out on tables for students to select. Not all items that cannot be disposed of are junk; the tenth copy of a novel that cannot be used at another library is still a good novel if it was good in the first place.

The feeling at Maunaolu College is to encourage people to give books, even if

only a fraction of them can be used. The main point is for the college library to become the concern of more and more persons outside the college community, and their continuing interest results in gaining many books which the library would eventually have to buy or would have to do without because of the greater need for acquiring new books and maintaining essential services.

An acute foreign observer of the American scene once remarked that the primary characteristic of American society is volunteerism. The small private junior college is often an outstanding example of this phenomenon, and its library can be one of the greatest beneficiaries. Without this voluntary sharing on the part of the local community, Maunaolu College's limited funds would not have permitted it to progress to the point of adequacy it has reached, modest as it is (7,390 catalogued volumes), or to conserve funds for the purchase of new books, books to strengthen weak areas, and expensive reference items. A community interested in its local college and conscious of the needs of its library can provide substantial support, even without dipping into its pocketbook for a dollar more than it already spends for its own reading.

## Recent Faculty and Instructional Practices in Junior Colleges

KEN AUGUST BRUNNER and CLARENCE B. LINDQUIST

JUNIOR COLLEGES seem to be faced with a triple dilemma. Along with other higher educational institutions they must first of all prepare to meet the onrushing tidal wave of students now in the secondary schools. A second, perhaps more frightening, look into the future reveals that many four-year colleges and universities are increasingly looking to the junior colleges to relieve them of some of the burdens of high future enrollments of freshman and sophomore students. Likely to be overlooked in the midst of this future age of students aplenty is the need to bring the collegiate level of education to a higher proportion of high school graduates than now receive it. Contingent problems are being recognized, and possible solutions are being tried out. This article deals with one of the problem areas—proper staffing.

Increasingly the literature has contained suggestions as to how to meet the need for college faculty members at a time when Ph.D.'s are just not keeping up

with the demand curve. To be sure, junior colleges have never actively sought the holders of the Ph.D. degree. A few—maybe as high as 10 per cent—have seemed adequate for any junior college faculty. The junior college needs the master teacher, not the research-oriented specialist, but as the four-year colleges and universities feel the Ph.D. pinch, they will be competing more and more for holders of the M.A. degree. Thus, they will be encroaching more and more upon a staffing area in which the junior colleges have been the most active.

It is a matter of concern, then, to consider the problem of securing and holding qualified college faculty members. There are a number of institutional practices possible to enable colleges and universities to cope with these problems. In order to determine the extent to which certain specified practices are being employed, and more particularly the extent to which they are being followed because of faculty shortages, the Office of Education in May, 1958, mailed a questionnaire to the presidents of 1,940 institutions of higher education in the United States and its outlying parts. There were 1,610 responses to the questionnaire received in time to be included in the study, and 376 of this number came from the universe of 493 junior colleges. The rate of response from

---

KEN AUGUST BRUNNER is Specialist for Associate Degree and Related Programs, Division of Higher Education, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

CLARENCE B. LINDQUIST is Chief for Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Division of Higher Education, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

the junior colleges, therefore, was 76.3 per cent. This compares with the 85.3 per cent response from all institutions except the junior colleges. The purpose of this article is to highlight the findings of the study as they relate to junior colleges, provide information that is more detailed concerning junior colleges than is given in either of two other publications,<sup>1</sup> and make comparisons between junior colleges and all the other colleges and universities.

As part of the data sought in the questionnaire, respondents were asked to check whether or not the practices listed in the instrument were followed during the period July, 1957, to June, 1958, and if they were, whether or not these practices had been followed: (1) due primarily to faculty shortages; (2) due equally to faculty shortages and other reasons; or (3) due primarily to reasons other than faculty shortages. Table 1 in this article contains the 21 practices which were listed on the instrument and gives the number and per cent of junior colleges and of institutions other than junior colleges following each practice during this period *because of any reason at all* in addition to the number and per cent of these categories of institutions following these practices *because of faculty shortages*. In this tabulation, institutions which followed practices due equally to faculty shortages and other reasons are considered to have followed this practice due to faculty shortages along with those

which had done so primarily for this reason.

Although institutions followed many of the practices for reasons other than faculty shortages, it is apparent that the employment of them would in most instances reduce the total need for staff. Many of the practices which formed the basis of this study have been followed in the nature of experiments, frequently supported by educational foundations. In other instances the practices may have been followed because they were considered to be sound administrative or educational actions.

#### PRACTICES FOLLOWED FOR ANY REASON

A number of analyses may be made of Table 1. First, it will be noted that junior colleges follow only two practices *for any reason* more frequently than the other colleges. The difference here is not great. It is more significant that there are sharp differences between practices followed by all other colleges from those followed by junior colleges in a number of items. For example, in making a comparison on the basis of percentage of use of practice, the practice of employing new faculty members at salaries relatively higher than formerly paid for corresponding ranks is followed by all other colleges 75 per cent more than it is followed by junior colleges. Similarly, only 11.1 per cent of the junior colleges report employing new faculty at relatively higher ranks than formerly given for corresponding positions, whereas other colleges and universities report 25.8 per cent. Thus, this practice is used (on a percentage basis) 132 per cent more by senior colleges than by community colleges. And in the practices of employing

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Lindquist's preliminary report of the findings of the study involving 1,557 institutions appeared in the November, 1958, issue of *Higher Education*, and a complete report has been published as U. S. Office of Education Bulletin No. 27, 1959, titled *College and University Faculties: Recent Personnel and Instructional Practices*.

TABLE 1  
*Extent of Use of Specified Practices in 376 Junior Colleges Compared with 1,234 Other Kinds of  
 Colleges in the United States During 1957-58*

PRACTICE	Followed Practice			Followed Practice Due to Faculty Shortages		
	For Any Reason	Junior Colleges	All Other Colleges	Junior Colleges	All Other Colleges	No. Percent*
1. Employment of retired professors and other retired persons	102	29.1	518	44.6	73	20.8
2. Employment part-time of persons whose incomes are mainly from other occupations	197	57.6	791	68.3	100	29.2
3. Sharing instructors and instructional facilities with other institutions	127	38.0	414	37.0	53	15.9
4. Employment of new faculty less qualified than formerly for positions occupied	159	45.0	515	44.5	148	41.9
5. Employment of new faculty at salaries (ranks same) relatively higher than formerly	138	39.8	801	69.7	129	37.2
6. Employment of new faculty at ranks (salaries relatively the same) relatively higher than formerly	36	11.1	282	25.8	27	8.4
7. Employment of new faculty at both ranks and salaries relatively higher than formerly	46	14.6	396	36.3	33	10.5
8. Accelerated promotion of faculty	46	15.2	302	28.4	26	8.6
9. Employment of some faculty members beyond mandatory retirement age	82	24.8	450	40.1	56	16.9
10. Increase of the established mandatory age limit	25	7.9	99	9.3	23	7.3
11. New fringe benefits established or existing ones increased	150	44.8	727	65.3	68	20.3
12. Salary increases of at least 5 percent per annum for faculty as a whole	279	82.5	961	85.1	140	41.4
13. Increase in the size of lecture sessions	144	41.5	536	46.8	81	23.3
14. Reduction of duplicating and overlapping course offerings	124	37.9	709	64.2	54	16.5
15. A significantly larger responsibility placed on student for his own learning	70	21.7	449	41.1	22	6.8
16. Use of non-professional assistants to help relieve faculty of non-teaching duties	85	25.0	430	38.5	39	11.5
17. Reduction in number of smaller classes	166	50.2	626	56.0	84	25.4
18. Elimination, curtailment, or postponement of some programs of study	159	47.0	536	47.6	76	22.5
19. Reduction in the number of subcollegiate courses of instruction	46	14.3	251	24.1	22	6.8
20. Courses given completely or primarily by television	12	3.5	71	6.5	3	0.9
21. Courses given completely or primarily by films	5	1.5	33	3.0	3	0.9

\* Percents in this column and other columns of this table are based upon the number of responses to each practice which varied due to the fact that some of the practices were not applicable in some situations and also some of the questionnaires were not fully completed.

new faculty members at both relatively higher salaries and ranks than formerly, the figure is 150 per cent. Of course, it is recognized that junior colleges are very much less prone to award any academic rank except "instructor."

It will be noted that some practices approach being used twice as much by the other colleges and universities as by junior colleges: accelerated promotions, more responsibility for learning, courses taught completely or primarily by TV, and courses taught completely or primarily by films.

The preceding analysis has been based upon a comparison of the percentage of use of each of the specified practices. An-

other approach is that of rank-order comparison in which, for junior colleges and likewise for all other colleges, the specified practices are listed in order of decreasing percentage of use of the practices. Table 2 gives this information for practices followed for any reason whatsoever and Table 3 for practices followed because of faculty shortages.

It can be observed that in only seven of the practices was there a difference in rank-order of three or more. The greatest difference was the practice of employing personnel at higher salaries. This was ranked eighth by the junior colleges as a practice followed for any reason in the past several years, whereas it was

TABLE 2

Practice Followed for Any Reason	Junior Colleges Rank Order	Other Colleges Rank Order	Diff. In Rank Order
Salary increase of at least 5 per cent	1	1	0
Employment of part-time persons	2	3	-1
Number of smaller classes reduced	3	6	-3
Programs eliminated, curtailed, postponed	4	7	-3
Employment of less qualified persons	5	10	-5
New or increased fringe benefits	6	4	2
Lecture sections enlarged	7	8	-1
Employment at higher salaries	8	2	6
Inter-institutional sharing	9	14	-5
Duplicate and overlapping courses reduced	10	5	5
Employment of retired persons	11	9	2
Non-professional assistants used	12	13	-1
Employment beyond retirement age	13	12	1
More student responsibility for learning	14	11	3
Accelerated promotions	15	16	-1
Employment at higher ranks and salaries	16	15	1
Subcollegiate courses reduced in number	17	18	-1
Employment at higher ranks	18	17	1
Retirement age raised	19	19	0
Courses completely or primarily by TV	20	20	0
Courses completely or primarily by films	21	21	0

ranked second by other colleges and universities. Three items showed a difference in rank-order of five positions. The junior colleges report as their fifth most important practice *for any reason* the employment of less qualified personnel than those who previously held the positions, whereas the four-year colleges and universities rank this tenth. The ninth most important reason cited by junior colleges was "inter-institutional sharing" which was ranked 14th by the other colleges and universities. In the other direction, what was ranked tenth by the junior colleges, that is, "reducing duplicated and overlapping courses," was ranked as fifth most important by four-year colleges and universities.

It may be of some concern to friends of the junior college to note that the third practice followed was the "reduction of the number of smaller classes," whereas this ranks sixth with other colleges and universities, especially in view of the fact that junior colleges tend to boast that they offer more direct faculty-student contact and more smaller class situations. Along the same line, it is notable also that "programs have been eliminated, curtailed, or postponed" ranks as the fourth most important practice by junior colleges, whereas this is seventh for the other colleges and universities. Another significant difference in rank-order is found in the 14th most important practice followed by junior colleges, "giving the student more responsibility for learning." The other colleges and universities rank this as the 11th most important practice followed for any reason in the past several years. It would seem here, too, that the junior colleges might re-examine their philosophies and consider giving this a more important place in the future.

#### PRACTICES FOLLOWED AS A RESULT OF FACULTY SHORTAGES

Practices followed because of faculty shortages bring out even more sharp differences between the practices followed by the junior colleges as compared to those followed by the other reporting institutions. For example, reporting institutions other than junior colleges are employing the following practices more, percentage-wise, than junior colleges: employment of new faculty at both ranks and salaries relatively higher than formerly, 197 per cent more; a significantly larger responsibility placed on the student for his own learning, 138 per cent more; accelerated promotion of faculty, 135 per cent more. There are other large differences, but they will again be examined by the rank-order differences method.

It will be noted that in this case there are only four instances where the differences are three or greater. The sharpest difference is one of six ranks. In 14th position is the practice of employing personnel at higher ranks and salaries than previously, whereas the other colleges and universities have found themselves compelled to use this as the eighth most important practice because of faculty shortages. In the other three examples, the junior colleges favored a practice over the other colleges and universities. For example, "programs were eliminated, curtailed, and postponed" in junior colleges more than they were in senior colleges as compared to other practices which were followed. This practice ranks seventh with the junior colleges and universities. The "inter-institutional sharing of faculty" was ranked 12th by the junior colleges and 16th by the other colleges and universities. "New or increased fringe benefits" was ranked

TABLE 3

Practice Followed Because of Faculty Shortages	Junior Colleges Rank Order	Other Colleges Rank Order	Diff. In Rank Order
Employment of less qualified persons	1	2	-1
Salary increase of at least 5 per cent	2	3	-1
Employment at higher salaries	3	1	2
Employment of part-time persons	4	4	0
Number of smaller classes reduced	5	7	-2
Lecture sections enlarged	6	5	1
Programs eliminated, curtailed, postponed	7	11	-4
Employment of retired persons	8	6	2
New or increased benefits	9	12	-3
Employment beyond retirement age	10	10	0
Duplicate and overlapping courses reduced	11	9	2
Inter-institutional sharing	12	16	-4
Non-professional assistants used	13	13	0
Employment at higher ranks and salaries	14	8	6
Accelerated promotions	15	15	0
Employment at higher ranks	16	14	2
Retirement age raised	17	19	-2
More student responsibility for learning	18.5	17	1.5
Subcollegiate courses reduced in number	18.5	18	0.5
Courses completely or primarily by TV	20.5	18	0.5
Courses completely or primarily by films	20.5	21	-0.5

17.5-17.5

ninth by the junior colleges and 12th by other colleges and universities. Other differences, as has been mentioned, were not as sharp.

Perhaps more important is the fact that junior colleges were not reporting that they were required to follow certain practices *due to faculty shortages* as much as senior colleges and universities. In no case did even one-half of the junior colleges report that they have had to resort to certain practices because of faculty shortages, whereas in the case of the four-year colleges and universities, 56.2 per cent have been required to employ people at relatively higher salaries than had been paid for the position in the past. Only five practices were reported by as many as 25

per cent of the junior college administrators as being required *because of the shortage of faculty*.

At the head of the list for the junior colleges the practice most commonly followed, as reported in this survey, was the employment of less qualified personnel than had previously filled the positions. Of the junior colleges, 41.9 per cent reported that they had to resort to this practice because of faculty shortage. Close on the heels of this practice was the salary increase of at least five per cent brought about because of faculty shortages. The third most commonly reported practice by junior colleges was employment at relatively higher salaries than previously had been paid for these positions. This practice

was followed by 37.2 per cent of the junior colleges. Ranked fourth by the junior colleges was the employment of part-time persons, at 29.2 per cent. And ranking fifth (this is the only other one that was reported by 25 per cent or more of the junior colleges) was that the number of smaller classes had been reduced—reported by 25.4 per cent of the junior colleges.

It is worth noting that the four-year colleges and universities reported 11 practices were followed by over 25 per cent of the institutions because of faculty shortage.

Another way of looking at this is to regard the number of practices that were followed due to faculty shortages as compared to those that were reported as being followed for any reason. In the case of the other colleges and universities, 17 practices were reported as being followed *for any reason*, not specifically because of faculty shortages, by over 25 per cent of the reporting institutions, whereas in the case of the junior colleges, 13 practices were reported as having been followed *for any reason* in the past several years. (An additional practice was reported as being followed by 24.8 per cent of the junior colleges.)

Perhaps the most obvious conclusion that can be tentatively arrived at from this recital of facts and from this analysis of the responses is that the junior colleges are less acutely aware of having followed certain of these practices because of the apparent developing shortages of teaching personnel. On the other hand, it may be the junior colleges have not yet felt the pinch of faculty shortages as much as other colleges and universities. This is borne out by an analysis of the comments

that were made in the responses to the Office of Education survey.

#### COMMENTS BY RESPONDENTS

In the form which was submitted to the junior colleges, respondents were invited to make general comments concerning faculty staffing problems (if any) at their institutions, methods of coping with them, and the relative effectiveness of these methods. The respondents were asked to specify the time period in which the problem occurred and improvement that was made. Some of the responses which follow indicate how junior colleges have recognized and coped with these new dimensions to the problem of faculty recruitment and retention.

A midwest junior college head pointed out that although he felt the problem had not yet affected his college as much as others because of its fine reputation, a program in electronics had to be delayed for one year until he could find a qualified person at the salary paid his instructional staff. The recession and fewer government contracts at an aircraft plant put him in a position to secure instructors in electronics and in physics.

Of interest to junior college authorities in reading open-ended responses to this survey are statements that point up the impression that in general junior colleges have not yet had any problem in recruiting faculty. At least four college presidents made statements to this effect. For example, the president of a public junior college in the Rocky Mountain states reports, "To date we have not experienced any great difficulty employing well-qualified teachers. We have several applications for each vacancy."

A similar statement was made by the

president of a California public junior college, and the president of a publicly-supported junior college in the Northwest reports, "We seem to have little difficulty now, or at any time in the past." A comparable written comment was made by the dean of a publicly-supported midwestern junior college.

Five junior college heads attributed their success in obtaining faculty to their newly achieved high salary schedules or to their prevailing high salary schedules. Some typical comments were as follows.

The president of a California junior college in a relatively isolated community went into some detail about his salary schedule. He pointed out that the range was from \$4,920 for a beginning teacher with a baccalaureate degree to \$9,250. A beginning M.A. degree teacher, and this is required for appointment as a junior college instructor in this community, "qualifies for a salary of \$5,880. Consequently, we have few staffing problems."

The dean of a publicly-supported midwestern junior college pointed out that his salaries were even better than those paid in other state institutions of higher education. Similar statements were made by the president of a publicly-supported junior college in a northwestern state and the dean of a Florida public junior college who pointed out that his salary schedule is above that of the other units of the public school systems in his area and in adjoining states. One midwestern junior college president enclosed his salary schedule as "part of the answer as to why we have no trouble getting good teachers."

Another means of attracting instructors to the junior college, also related to the salary question, is that pointed out by the assistant dean in charge of a branch of a

large midwestern metropolitan junior college. He said, "Of perhaps greatest significance is the fact that new teachers may be placed in the salary schedules above the minimum, in consideration of experience." This practice of paying higher beginning salaries than the usual scale for beginning college teachers was also reported by other junior colleges. Especially was this the case in areas such as science and engineering. Some remarks were made by two-year college heads to illustrate this problem area. Typically, the president of a public community college in New York commented that because of the difficulty they have getting staff members with engineering degrees, "We have not attempted to start technical staff members at the beginning instructor level."

A comment made by the president of a junior college in an eastern state indicates that his location has been an asset:

Because of our location we find that a great source of part-time teachers is among younger faculty and graduate students at neighboring institutions, but these arrangements, though commonly effected through officials at the neighboring institutions, are always on an individual basis and cannot be said to constitute 'Sharing facilities with other institutions.'

One of the public junior college heads even credited his active teachers' retirement plan along with the availability of social security as among the reasons he has little faculty turnover.

A number of heads of junior colleges which shared facilities with a high school, or which were a part of a large high school, reported that they had no problem at all in obtaining satisfactory, qualified instructors for the junior college. A sample

comment was made by a midwestern public junior college president: "This questionnaire does not apply to any great extent to a junior college that is part of a large high school."

The dean of a publicly-supported junior college in a Middle Atlantic state reported, "One of the ways we have met faculty needs in the junior college is by recognizing outstanding ability and superior preparation of secondary school teachers who may be interested in working with older young people." In considering the relationship between the high school and the junior college the president of a California junior college commented, "Being part of a city system in which we have several schools under the same board of education we have from time to time taken outstanding people from these faculties and brought them to the college." Still another California junior college head, who is also the superintendent of a public junior college district, reports that because of his location within 16 miles of a large state university, within 16 miles of a state college and fairly close to a prominent privately-supported university, he has no difficulty in securing a faculty.

Other reasons cited to support the ease with which faculty members were obtained for junior colleges were: pleasant teaching climate, which was reported by the dean of a publicly-supported midwestern junior college, and a stable enrollment, which came from the president of a state-supported junior college in the Southeast. "Ours is a state-supported junior college offering liberal arts primarily. Almost no changes in curriculum nor changes in teacher personnel took place during the times mentioned. We added two new instructors in 1957 but had no

trouble getting them and employed them under the same policies as existed in the immediate past."

A similar statement was made by another junior college president in a southeastern state. He, too, reported a constant enrollment and stable faculty. The president went on to say, "We usually have more applications from qualified people than we can possibly use in our faculty. Insofar as we have had the need to increase our faculty, we have depended largely upon our personal acquaintance with or knowledge of qualified people."

The president of a New England technical institute reports that faculty members are permitted to do research and consulting work for the equivalent of one day a week. Apparently this is a method he has used successfully to cope with the shortage of the scientific and engineering faculty members reported by a number of junior college presidents.

At least eight junior college heads made comments about the difficulty of securing instructors in the technical areas and in the sciences. By far this item received the greatest number of comments.

Typical of the responses was one made by the dean of a public junior college in a northwestern state who said:

The only staffing problem we have encountered has been the filling of a position on the engineering staff. Industry pays such high beginning salaries compared to teaching salaries and combining this with a policy of strict adherence to a salary schedule, we do have a difficult problem. Perhaps this may be solved by turning to the source of immigrant engineers that are migrating to this country. We are exploring this possibility now.

An eastern junior college head also reported difficulty in hiring fully-trained experienced instructors in the "physical sci-

ences, engineering, and mathematics at the salary levels which this college can afford to pay. The problem has been partially solved by the part-time employment of academically qualified instructors with no previous instructional experience."

Other shortages singled out for comments by the junior college heads were of trained librarians as well as women's physical education instructors. Again this problem was reported by heads of junior colleges in the Midwest and in California.

A California junior college director reported that he particularly had trouble finding "credentialed" persons to teach physical education. In some cases, this director said even when he could find people properly credentialed he had not found them sufficiently well-qualified to do the job he wanted done.

A plains state junior college academic dean reported a similar difficulty. Being church-related, his school depends on the membership of the supporting church body for recruiting members of its staff. They are not necessarily, therefore, from the same state in which the college is located. The dean stated, "Our principal difficulty is meeting the certification requirements established for junior colleges of the state. The certification requirements were set for secondary schools without cooperation of the junior colleges. No improvement made."

The problem of finding adequate properly certified teaching personnel was also noted by the head of a Florida junior college. According to state requirements applicants for junior college instructor certification must possess a master's degree and a minimum of 15 graduate hours in the teaching field. The dean said, "This is

a requirement of our State Department of Education along with the professional courses in education. We are sometimes at a disadvantage in hiring persons with advanced degrees who do not have the professional education courses."

The same problem was commented on by the director of a California public junior college who said that some of his applicants "have several years of experience and sufficient qualifications, but do not have the work in formalized education." To solve this problem, he usually obtains provisional credentials for these people until they can complete the required work, usually in professional education courses.

The head of a large midwestern metropolitan junior college branch found that his college has been taking less qualified persons in all areas. "Where we could get Ph.D.'s, especially in English, and social sciences before 1956, now we can't get Ph.D.'s even in these 'surplus' areas."

Although (as reported in the tabular data) a number of junior colleges used faculty rank to meet the problem of obtaining additional instructors, the president of a midwestern church-sponsored college said, "Since we are a junior college, our major problem concerns itself with ranking professors and with the problem of permanent tenure. We are a church-sponsored school and the church suggests five ranks: assistant, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Since we have only 27 faculty members we would like to have only one rank. We believe it would make procurement and retention of faculty personnel more successful." At a time when some junior colleges are known to be considering using faculty rank as a means of at-

tracting new members to the faculty or as a way of undergirding merit pay provisions, it is well to heed the remarks of one who has had experience with rank and dislikes the results.

Another dimension to this problem is pointed out by the director of a California junior college, who said, "In the past we have had little difficulty in obtaining adequate, competent instructors for our college. However, we have noted this year that applicants were very reluctant to accept the first offer. They seem to be shopping and looking for higher salaries. We have had a greater number of refusals this year because our salary schedule is not as attractive as it formerly was. We have been unable to increase our salaries on a proportionate basis with wealthier districts."

A number of junior college administrators chose to present problems for which they had not yet found solutions. Other persons chose to make comments which illustrated the problems they had met and the apparently successful attempts they made to solve these problems.

In southern California a public junior college head reported, "We have resorted to the use of the best qualified people we can get from industry on a part-time basis. This is not completely satisfactory, however, because there are so many activities that cannot be expected of part-time personnel."

The president of a publicly-supported technical institute in New York reported similarly: "Staffing has not been too difficult so far. Our evening sessions employ many teachers on a part-time basis who work full-time in industry. The majority of our new teachers in the day program have been recruited from this source."

Frequently junior college heads mentioned the use of retired personnel. The president and superintendent of a public junior college district in California reported, "I have one retired Admiral teaching mathematics, and he is doing a fine job."

The head of a metropolitan junior college in the Midwest tapped still another source of potential college instructors, i.e., married women of the community who hold master's degrees and are fully qualified to teach. This junior college head finds that they are especially useful because they are happy to teach part time. It may be that the shortage of junior college faculty members which is expected to develop in the future will encourage more administrators to look for women already in their communities as potential instructional personnel. However, some of the junior college heads have pointed out that they have been forced to go to other areas of the country to find sufficient staff.

A southern California junior college head reported that he went out of his state to solve his staffing problems. Similarly, the dean of a midwestern junior college reported, "While no major difficulties have yet been encountered, the mathematics and chemistry areas are becoming more and more difficult. We are increasing our faculty at a current rate of 20 per cent per year. By robbing the South we have held our own. But what happens when the southern wells run dry?" Some comments pointed out that junior college heads have accepted personnel with qualifications which were more limited than they desired, such as limited teaching experience.

Some successful solutions to the staffing problem reported by junior college

heads pertain to looking after the faculty well-being. For example, the junior college president of a church-related institution in the Southeast mentioned that if members of his faculty let him know of their desires early enough in the year he will help them to secure better paying positions elsewhere. For this reason he believes he has a happy faculty, secure in the knowledge that he will—because he has in the past—get them promotions which they desire even though they are not themselves aware that such jobs may be available.

Other college presidents mentioned that in order to help solve their staffing problems they granted financial assistance and encouragement to faculty members to obtain higher degrees, and, in some cases, secured foundation support for them to do research. In still other cases, presidents told of obtaining fellowships for their faculty members. The dean of a publicly-supported junior college in the Midwest said he permitted his instructors to hold additional jobs, although, "this is not exactly encouraged."

A church-related junior college in the East reported another approach to the faculty shortage problem:

Group technique (group work, reporting to entire class) and the other devices . . . have not only extended our teacher power but increased our student power tremendously. Self-education is definitely a part of our program and it is working. The students themselves are convinced of the *power* of their independent work and the importance of sharing their findings with others.

Thus it can be seen that the comments that were made fall into three major categories: (1) some junior college presidents indicated they were having no difficulty

in recruiting faculty; (2) others stated problems for which solutions have not yet been found; and (3) successful solutions to difficulties were mentioned by a few two-year college heads. To break these down further, the following factors were listed as reasons for the above:

- (1) *No difficulty recruiting faculty:*
  - Pay generally high salaries
  - Enter persons at higher than the minimum starting salaries
  - Have good retirement plan
  - Share facilities with the high schools
  - Upgrade high school teachers
  - Have a good location near a major university
  - Have a pleasant teaching climate
  - Permit science and technical instructors one day off each week for research for additional income.
- (2) *Problems not yet solved:*
  - Cannot get science and technical instructors
  - Cannot get instructors in women's physical education department, librarians, or nursing education
  - Have problems with state certification requirements
  - Employ candidates with advanced degrees but no professional education courses
  - Cannot get Ph.D.'s even in social sciences or humanities
  - Need women teachers to balance the staff
  - Prefer *not* to have academic rank
  - Find an unwillingness to accept the first offer which was made
  - Have a low salary schedule
  - Are poorly located.
- (3) *Solutions which were followed successfully:*
  - Used part-time staff and faculty from industry
  - Employed persons who have become "disenchanted" with industry
  - Employed retired persons
  - Employed married women holding master's degrees on a part-time or regular basis

- "Robbed" the South or other states
- Hired persons with some work beyond the master's degree instead of Ph.D.'s
- Hired persons with limited teaching experience
- Took persons with bachelor's degrees (who turned out to be good instructors)
- Got fellowships and research grants for faculty members
- Encouraged independent work by students.

#### CONCLUSION

From the comments made and from an analysis of the data which appeared in the tables, it is safe to conclude that as time goes on and junior colleges begin to compete more with the four-year colleges and universities for faculty members, it is likely that these practices will be followed to a greater extent by an increasing number of junior colleges. The fact that the four-year colleges have resorted to more of

these practices than the junior colleges indicates that they are having somewhat more difficulty in securing faculty or that they are more interested in improving the lot of faculty members. This means that the junior college administrators will either have to become aware of the need to treat the instructional staff better or they will lose their personnel in increasing numbers to senior institutions.

It may be that the present time is appropriate for junior college heads to try out some of the practices which they have not yet used or have not yet been required to use during this period of relative adequacy of junior college instructional staff. Then, should the time come when there is a shortage of junior college instructors and competition becomes keener for their services administrators will be able to make intelligent decisions based on the experience they have had with some of the techniques mentioned here.

## A Profile of Junior College Presidents

RAY HAWK

THE SPECTACULAR surge of college-age students continuing their education beyond secondary school has placed educational institutions under relentless pressure and, rather than abating, the situation will become more acute in the foreseeable future. States will find various ways to cope with this challenge. It is increasingly apparent, however, that the local community-junior college will assume a significant portion of this burden. The geographical impact of this expansion is obvious when junior college development under way in Florida, California, Michigan, Massachusetts and other states is observed. Paralleling this growth is the more critical problem of educational leadership. Obviously this crisis is not new. Educational spokesmen have predicted for years that the shortage of competent teachers and administrators is the major hurdle to overcome if students are to have an opportunity for optimum educational development.

The junior college position in the educational scheme is in many respects similar to that of the American junior high school when it first appeared on the educational ladder. It was considered too sophisticated for elementary folks and too juvenile for the high school. The junior college has been in the position of either being con-

sidered an upward extension of the public schools, without the prestige normally assigned to collegiate institutions, or considered by some senior schools as a "poor relation" at the lower division level. Progress has recently been made in achieving status independent of either public schools or four-year colleges. This is important in determining the type of school executives who will be attracted to the junior college presidencies.

Historically most public junior colleges have been financially dependent upon the local community as a part of the local school system with the superintendent of schools in charge. Administrators of junior colleges for the most part have, therefore, been developed in the public school systems. In a 1953 study, Dr. Leo J. Roland, professor of education and head of the education department at Villa Maria College, Erie, Pennsylvania, found in a survey of 136 junior college administrators that 70 per cent had been secondary school teachers and 19 per cent had taught in elementary schools at one time in their careers, thus supporting the contention that junior college administrators in the past have migrated from public school positions.<sup>1</sup> Major support for this position was forthcoming in a random sur-

---

RAY HAWK is Dean of Men, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>1</sup> Leo J. Roland, "Professional Preparation of Junior College Administrators," *Junior College Journal*, October, 1953, pp. 72-80.

vey of 88 institutional executives conducted by Dr. Algo D. Henderson, director of the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Michigan. In a speech delivered in New York in February, 1958, Dr. Henderson itemized the following professional experiences for the 88 executives.<sup>2</sup>

The current study was undertaken to establish a profile on the junior college's chief executive officer. Were the facts discovered in 1953 by Roland and the more limited sample by Henderson indicative of a status quo or were discernible trends changing the scene? In an attempt to gain answers to these questions 175 presidents were queried with reports completed by 162 for a 93 per cent return. Institutions were selected on a ratio of about 2-1 public to private with two major criteria of

selection. First, a wide geographical distribution of institutions including virtually all of the states was sought, and second, the larger schools with the more complex programs were given preference. Respondents were asked seven basic questions: (1) age upon assuming present position, (2) number of years in the position, (3) previous position held, (4) highest degree earned, (5) principal field of academic specialization, (6) type of position predecessor took upon leaving, (7) length of time he served as head of the college.

For simplicity and to avoid a confusion of names and titles throughout this article, junior college will be used in preference to other possible titles. The same applies in reference to the administrative head of the junior college, who will be referred to as president. The survey helped clarify this issue since each respondent was asked to sign the questionnaire listing his title, thus making it possible to analyze the current titles of the 162 administrators.

TABLE I  
*Previous Professional Experiences of Community-Junior College Executives*

Previous Experiences	Number Reporting Experience	Percent
Junior college administrative responsibility	53	60.2
High school administrative responsibility	38	43.1
High school teaching	36	40.9
College teaching	30	34.0
Junior college teaching	28	31.8
Superintendent of schools	21	23.8
Junior college guidance/counseling responsibility	20	22.7
College administrative responsibility	15	17.0
Grade school-junior high school teaching	14	15.9
Military/government administrative responsibility	12	13.6
Elementary and junior high school administration	10	11.3
High school guidance/counseling responsibility	7	7.9
Business industry experience	6	6.8
Clergy	6	6.8

TABLE II  
*Titles Held by Chief Executive Officers of Junior Colleges*

Title	Number	Percent
President	106	65.4
Dean	35	21.6
Director	15	9.3
Other*	6	3.7
Total	162	100.0

\* Principal, Superintendent, Provost, etc.

Compilation of the returns furnished interesting data especially when questions concerning the 64 presidents elected in the past five years were compared with those previously appointed. By this method it was possible to ascertain trends that could have considerable significance. For instance, the average age at time of appointment for the 162 administrators is 42.5 years, but when this figure is divided between those presidents appointed in the past five years contrasted with those appointed more than five years ago, a definite trend is observed. The 64 presidents elected within the past five years average 44.6 years at time of appointment compared to 41.1 years, thus indicating that current selections place emphasis upon men more mature in years and experience to serve as chief executive officers.

Moreover, this conclusion has further support in the degrees held by these men. Considering the total group, seven or 4.3 per cent had baccalaureate degrees, 84 or 51.9 per cent had master's degrees, and 71 or 43.8 per cent held the doctorate. Roland also found in his sample that 43 per cent held the doctor's degree.

Recently Dr. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., executive director of the American Association of Junior Colleges, compiled data

supplied his office by 378 presidents who were up-dating their personnel records. Following approximately the same ratio of public to private (241-137), he found that 35.7 per cent held the doctorate, 57 per cent a master's and 6.9 per cent a baccalaureate degree; however, when both the current sample and Gleazer's study are divided by the five-year criterion a marked difference is noted in the advanced graduate degrees. In the present study, presidents appointed to office more than five years ago included 62.2 per cent with the master's degree and 33.7 per cent with doctorates. Appointees of the past five years have 35.9 per cent with the master's degree and 59.4 per cent with doctorates, or virtually a complete reversal in master's and doctor's degrees. Gleazer's data indicate the same trends, although less pronounced, undoubtedly due to the more restrictive nature of the writer's sample. Gleazer's figures show that presidents of over five years' tenure held 64.5 per cent master's degrees and 27.7 per cent doctorates, whereas in the past five years there were 47.5 per cent masters' and 46.3 per cent doctors' degrees. These data bolster the conclusion that current demands for junior college presidents are for more mature and experienced men who likely hold a doctor's degree. It is interesting to note how junior college presidents' academic degrees compare with those of four-year college presidents and deans.

#### PREPARING FOR THE PRESIDENCY

Previous references have acknowledged public school background as the most common road to a junior college presidency. The current study would, in part, support this conclusion; however, a new

TABLE III  
*Degrees Held by College Administrators\**

	Four-Year College Presidents No. Percent		Four-Year College Deans No. Percent		Junior College Presidents No. Percent	
Baccalaureate	4	5.1	7	8.2	7	4.3
Master's	8	10.1	10	11.8	84	51.9
Doctorate	67	84.8	68	80.0	71	43.8
Total	79	100.0	85	100.0	162	100.0

\* Legend: Data concerning college presidents were obtained from the *Association of American Colleges Bulletin* and *Who's Who in America*. A random sample of 100 four-year college deans conducted on approximately the same formula used in the junior college sample yielded 85 returns.

TABLE IV  
*Fields of Specialization of College Administrators  
(Highest Earned Degrees Held in Following Areas)*

Academic Field	Four-Year College President No. Percent		Four-Year College Dean No. Percent		Junior College President No. Percent	
Humanities	13	16.4	12	14.1	12	7.4
Social Sciences	27	34.2	20	23.5	39	24.1
Sciences	13	16.4	12	14.1	22	13.6
Education	9	11.4	17	20.0	80	49.4
Other Professions	17	21.6	24	28.3	9	5.5
Total	79	100.0	85	100.0	162	100.0

trend is noticeable. Reviewing the highest earned degrees of the 162 administrators reveals that 73 or 45 per cent of the total have their advanced degrees in the liberal arts; 12 in the humanities, 39 in the social sciences and 22 in the sciences. Eighty or 49.4 per cent have their advanced degrees in professional education and 9 have advanced work in other professional areas. The table above compares junior college presidents' fields of specialization with a sample of four-year college presidents and deans.

Comparisons of these three types of administrators point-up differences that exist

in their academic preparation. Four-year college presidents appear strong in the social sciences; deans incline toward degrees in their professional fields (business administration and engineering are good examples); and about 50 per cent of the junior college presidents take graduate degrees in professional education.

Since one-half of the junior college presidents majored in academic areas and nearly one-half of the doctors appointed in the last five years have the Ph.D. degree rather than advanced professional degrees, the trend seems to be that future administrators will have

stronger liberal arts preparation as well as the necessary preparation in professional education. This would appear to be a desirable outcome as junior colleges reach maturity and more clearly define their mission. May it not be a logical result of more understanding and support from the senior colleges and universities?

Many senior schools have already "joined hands" with the junior colleges in an effort to help them meet curricular and leadership problems. Development of strong junior college departments in schools of education, founded upon a strong liberal arts base with a thorough background of philosophy and principles of education, will have a marked influence on the future leadership of these institutions. It can be expected that junior colleges in increasing numbers will turn to the universities for leadership and guidance.

Many universities have added prominent junior college executives to their education school faculties to assist this development. Good examples are Dr. Jesse P. Bogue, former executive director of the American Association of Junior Colleges, now at the University of Michigan; Dr. Walter Sindlinger, former dean of Orange County Community College, Middletown, New York, at Teachers College; Dr. Herman Spindt, former dean of Bakersfield College, at the University of California at Berkeley; Dr. B. Lamar Johnson, former dean of instruction of Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri, at the University of California at Los Angeles; Dr. C. C. Colvert, former president of Northeastern Junior College, Monroe, Louisiana, at the University of Texas; Dr. J. W. Reynolds, former Dean of Fort Smith Junior College, Fort Smith, Arkansas, at the Univer-

sity of Texas and Dr. William Crawford, former dean of Dodge City College, Dodge City, Kansas, at Washington State University. These men and many others who were not mentioned represent a growing trend in educational programs in which many universities can be expected to participate.

In addition to the interest demonstrated by the universities, educational foundations are considering financial assistance to support training of junior college administrators. It is possible that announcements will be forthcoming indicating direct financial support of this cause.

The sample has been analyzed regarding previous positions held by incumbent presidents to support the contention that universities will become a principal source of future leadership. Following the same five-year criterion, presidents in office less than five years were subdivided by public and private institutions. More than five years ago, a principal source of leadership was from junior college staff members. This is no longer the case. In keeping with the trend for more experienced administrators, more presidents are selected from four-year institutions (4 professors and 27 administrators) and from public school administration (1 teacher and 34 principals and public school superintendents). In searching for new executives, the private schools rely heavily (52.9%) upon senior colleges. The public institutions depend primarily upon men already presidents of junior colleges or who have served as public school administrators, although senior college administrators are an increasing source of supply. Gleazer's data show that 63.5 per cent of the junior college presidents came from higher education positions and 20.9 per cent from

TABLE V

*Previous Positions Held by Incumbent Presidents*

Type of Position	In Office Over Five Years		In Office Less Than Five Years			Total No. Percent
	No.	Percent	Private No. Percent	Public No. Percent		
Jr. Col. Presidency	17	17.4	3	17.7	15	31.9
Jr. Col. Staff	33	33.7	0	.....	6	12.8
Pub. School Adm.	20	20.4	0	.....	15	31.9
Four-Year College	13	13.3	9	52.9	9	19.1
Govt. or Foundation	7	7.1	1	5.9	2	4.3
Ministry	7	7.1	4	23.5	0	.....
Private Industry	1	1.0	0	.....	0	.....
Total	98	100.0	17	100.0	47	100.0
					64	100.0

the public schools. While he does not break down the higher education category, he does note that the promotion of men to presidencies from the junior college ranks overwhelmingly occurs within the same school.

**UPWARD MOBILITY OF JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS**

The last facet of this study concerns the mobility of junior college presidents. Where do they go when they resign their positions? Is the junior college presidency an end in itself? Is it a good stepping stone to administration in four-year colleges and universities? How long do they remain in these positions? These and many other questions have been asked. An effort has been made, therefore, to determine from this sample what became of 151 presidents who immediately preceded the incumbents. The size of the sample was reduced by 11 as that many schools were new.

Approximately one-third of the sample definitely is terminal as 41 presidents retired and 11 died in office; about one-sixth joined four-year schools (15 as administrators and 10 as professors), and

TABLE VI  
*Type of Position Taken by Predecessors After Leaving Junior College*

Position Taken	Number	Percentage
Retired	41	27.1
Accepted another presidency	18	11.9
Four-year college administration	15	9.9
Public school administration	14	9.3
Private business	13	8.6
Government or foundations	11	7.3
Deceased	11	7.3
Four-year college teaching	10	6.6
Another jr. col. position	8	5.3
Ministry	6	4.0
Returned to graduate school	4	2.7
Total	151	100.0

another one-sixth remained in junior college work (18 took a new presidency and 8 returned to the classroom). Public school administration (normally school superintendents), educational positions with governmental agencies and positions with educational foundations claimed another one-sixth of the group. The remaining members are widely distributed.

Relative to tenure of office, the sample

shows the junior college president has been in his position an average of 9.2 years, which was the exact figure found by Roland in his study. Since there is no way to determine how much longer the presidents will remain with their present positions, they were asked how long their predecessors remained in office. This figure was 10.3 years or a surprisingly small increase. It is safe to assume the average tenure of office is approximately 10 years. In his speech to the American Association of Junior Colleges in February, 1958, Dr. Algo D. Henderson indicated that leadership in 486 junior colleges in 24 states changed hands 487 times during the 1947-57 period. His study included 286 public and 200 private schools. The 286 public schools had 288 changes, whereas the 200 private schools changed 199 times indicating a 10 per cent annual average turnover in top executives with practically no difference whether the school was public or private. This seems to be reliable evidence that the cycle is probably complete in each decade.

In final summary, the aspiring junior college presidents who fit the profile established in this study will meet the following criteria. Percentages indicate that about

one-half of these men will devote their lives to the junior college field. The largest number will remain until retirement; some will die in office; a sizeable number will move on to other presidencies, and the remaining will choose other assignments within the colleges. They will be approximately 45 years of age and will hold a doctor's degree. Despite the number of education majors, nearly one-half of the doctorates will be Ph.D. degrees.

The administrator's experience will most likely have been in higher education, particularly with a senior college if he is president of a private junior college. If his previous position was as a staff officer in a junior college, his presidency will likely be in the same school. He can expect to remain with his position for approximately 10 years at the end of which time he has good possibilities of promotion to one of the following positions: another junior college presidency, a public school superintendency, a senior college post, a position with an educational foundation or in government. With such a bright picture of future potential in junior college administration, it can be expected that these schools will attract their share of top leadership.

## Your Best Foot Forward, Please!

IONE McCRAIN

WHO ELSE can sell the library and its wares better than the interested and wide-awake librarian? And if the librarian doesn't do just that, how will it get done? Librarians are proverbially modest and too many times wait until they are told that they may brag about their stock in trade before they do even the faintest crowing about their library's accomplishments.

A junior college librarian is usually well acquainted with the catalog of his school, as well as with those of schools in the geographical area and in the same category. He is also familiar with senior college and university catalogs from neighboring schools because the junior college students are always considering where to go upon graduation, and college catalogs are popular reading. High school students and their parents also have particular interest in college catalogs, and a librarian who fails to get an adequate write-up in his college catalog is simply missing a good chance to inform the public about the status of his library.

In perusing college catalogs, the writer has found a number of disappointing entries concerning the library: "The third floor houses a large pleasant library where students have direct access to the book stacks." In another catalog, the library

rated only six words in this all-inclusive sentence: "The second floor houses a well-equipped nursing laboratory for a class of 20 nurses, the Speech Department, several faculty offices, the Alumni office and a spacious and pleasing library."

Following the group which fails to mention the library at all or gives it one part of a sentence or at the most, one complete sentence, there is an entry which contains from 60-100 words, but which says very little about the library: "The library is noted for its well-selected collection of modern reference works in almost any academic field as well as for its fiction and periodicals. . ." The reader does not know how many books the library has nor how many magazines are available. "It has long been considered one of the best community college collections in the state," the entry continues but does not include important information about the library's facilities.

An entry which is approximately the same length, perhaps shorter, gives a great deal more information: "There is an excellent library of 13,000 volumes, also pamphlets, magazines, files, maps, atlases, charts, recordings, and music; current numbers of more than 40 magazines are received as well as local and national newspapers. Community college students may also use the Blakiston Regional Library, with 140,000 books, 5,792 recordings, and a film library."

---

IONE McCRAIN is Librarian, Sheridan College, Sheridan, Wyoming.

There is a group of excellent and slightly longer accounts of which the following is typical: "The College Library with a staff of two professional librarians and ten student assistants serves students and faculty with 32,000 volumes with many open shelves. There are sizable collections of documents, pamphlets, clippings and bibliographical aids. The Library subscribes to 181 general, scientific, literary and educational periodicals, as well as state and national newspapers. The library occupies the whole second floor of the Administration Building, will seat 120 people and is open 63 hours a week.

"It has an outstanding collection of 9,000 novels—English, American and European in English translation—the gift of James Muir. Students may use the County Library collection of 60,000 books and the College librarian can borrow materials on inter-library loan for students and faculty through the State University and the regional bibliographical center in the area."

If a library is worthy of inclusion in a college catalog, it deserves a well-written account. Catalog copy is an excellent way to inform the board, faculty, students and administrator of the library's facilities.

## **Career Day on Campus: Day of Exploration and Excitement**

**LARRY DORSETT**

**CAREER DAY!** A day of exploration and of excitement; a day when a whole new world opens for young men and women who will soon be attending college—the institution toward which these young adults have, consciously or unconsciously, been directing their whole lives.

We salute you, Seniors! from wherever you are. Welcome to Navarro on this, your Career Day.

To get on to the subject at hand: We know that your head is a-buzz with questions of vital importance.

First you ask, "Why should I go to a junior college?"

Then think on this: Have you ever had the feeling: "I'm nothing. My teacher knows me as a sexless, lifeless number; as a statistic. My friends look out for themselves, Devil take the hindmost. Why try? No one helps me when I need it. No one cares!"

Sound like a beatnik? It's not. That feeling is to be found in two places—military service and in major colleges. It is a natural result that (whether in the military or in a university) as the number of either personnel or students increases, the attention allowable for each individual decreases. In the military it's not so bad—at least you have your NCO and your First Sergeant who are within reach for the discussion of problems. In a large four-year college, as a member of a freshman class

of—1,000? . . . 1,200? or 2,000—the difference is almost unbelievable.

Straight from high school come the lambs . . . used to the attention of teachers when they couldn't understand a problem or idea, used to their friends in the hallways . . . the feeling of friendliness? . . . that word will do for want of better.

And you hear: "She couldn't understand the stuff. No one helped her."

"He left after one semester."

"So-and-so flunked."

"Momma, I tried, but I was so homesick I couldn't study."

The feeling of friendliness and closeness is lacking, but this is what Navarro Junior College offers—this thing called friendliness—and the other thing so closely allied to friendliness—helpfulness. The teachers and instructors at NJC are well known throughout the student world for always having time to listen to you and your problems; and believe us when we say that this is very important, especially to first-year students.

"Why should I go to Navarro Junior College?"—That is another self-asked question on Career Day. Well, look at it this way: there are very excellent dorms at nominal fees (take a realistic look at costs of college living—then you'll know why we say "nominal.") And socially there are many dances and other "doings," besides what is offered in Corsicana.

Navarro Junior College is a school rated high, both scholastically and in sports; a school with students and faculty who are both friendly and helpful. That's Navarro, a school about which you'll ask yourself one last question: "Why should I go anywhere else?"

---

**EDITOR'S NOTE:** Occasionally, we receive a contribution from a student—probably the most reprinted article in *Junior College Journal* was one by a former junior college student, Raymond A. Crippen. At

the time he wrote the article, "I Will Never Regret Junior College," he was a student at the University of Minnesota. The article dealt with his reactions to Worthington (Minnesota) Junior College, and appeared in the January, 1952, issue of *Junior College Journal*.

We like this article which appeared in the March 20, 1959, issue of *The Growl*, the newspaper of Navarro Junior College, Corsicana, Texas. We publish it with the permission of Dr. Ben W. Jones, president of Navarro Junior College.

## Analysis of Junior College Growth

EDMUND J. GLEAZER, JR.

THERE HAS been some tendency in this country to look upon increasing enrollments in colleges and universities as a kind of national calamity, second only to the not dissimilar problem of what to do with all of our wheat and corn and butter and eggs. Our reason tells us that we do have a problem here; however, as we examine our basic beliefs—what we hold to be true—those basic convictions which support and sustain the society of free men in which we live, thoughtful people are grateful that there are so many young people and adults who are inclined to yield themselves in growing thousands to the discipline and insights of higher education.

The time has come when the citizens of America must have more than an academic interest in extending opportunities for higher education. The kind of society we consider of value requires a constantly rising level of education. This fact has been amply demonstrated in the fields of science and technology. It is equally true in man's social relations but unfortunately there is a greater lag here in our comprehension of need. A member of the President's Cabinet recently stated that the most serious problem we face in this country over the next 25 years is the need for trained manpower. He affirmed that we need urgently to develop all of our human resources and that education has this basic responsibility. In a similar vein, former

Harvard President James Bryant Conant is quoted in *Time* magazine as saying, "A modern industrial nation needs more than a few brains; it has to uplift talent at every level. It cannot afford technological unemployables—spiritually, politically, or economically."

There is no questioning the fact that the perpetuation of our society requires people of learning, but sometimes we forget a corollary imperative: There is also the American dream of self fulfillment—the liberation of the human mind because that in and of itself is good and ought to happen. As this ideal agitates within the context of the social and economic facts of our generation and the one to come, the result will surely be dramatic developments in the field of education. And no picture of American education today is complete without inclusion of the junior college.

### GROWTH CONTINUES

Growth in the numbers of junior colleges and in students enrolled continues to be dramatic. There is a real likelihood that in making projections of student enrollments over the next ten years educators have been too conservative and have not given sufficient attention to two extremely important factors, the motivating influence of proximity of an institution of higher education; and the effect of a variety of college programs to match a

variety of student interests and aptitudes. An example of the importance of proximity is the case of Chipola Junior College in Jackson County, Florida. At the time the junior college was established in 1947 only seven per cent of the high school graduates in that county enrolled in college. In 1959, twelve years later, 52 per cent of the high school graduates began college careers. About seven per cent attended institutions outside of the county. The rest enrolled at Chipola Junior College. It is quite clear that a high percentage would not have begun college work at all if it had not been for the existence of the junior college. This story is being repeated throughout the country where similar opportunities are available.

The impact of appropriate courses being available has been demonstrated recently at Bakersfield College, California. In September, 1957, 23 students were admitted to the new two-year program in nursing at that institution. Twenty-one of the students were graduated from the college with the Associate in Arts degree in June, 1959. The graduates took state board examinations for licensure as registered nurses in California during the summer. The entire class passed. Seventeen of these registered nurses are currently employed in the Bakersfield area. As a group, the class consisted of 20 women and one man. The age range was 17-plus years to 46. At the time of admission 10 students were single and 11 were married. Four students married during the course of the program. Married students had from one to four children in their families; one student had three grandchildren. Undoubtedly many of the persons included in the class would not have entered the nursing field if the asso-

ciate degree program had not been available in the local community.

Junior colleges established throughout this country in increasing numbers and placed within commuting distance of the majority of residents in many of the states will be responsible for greatly increasing the number of people who will experience some kind of post-secondary instruction. Moreover, there will be an increasing number of the students who, having taken two years of post-secondary work, will have both inclination and ability to continue their education in the upper division of four-year colleges and universities.

#### THREE STATES ILLUSTRATE EXPANSION

In many states junior colleges are well recognized and their development is orderly and according to plan. Among these states are Florida, New York, and California. Last year, in those 26 counties of Florida in which the services of public junior colleges were available, 75 per cent of the students enrolling in college for the first time chose the junior college. Florida has authorized four additional areas for junior colleges.

In New York State the first locally sponsored community junior college was established in 1950. There were 257 full-time students. Nine years later there were 13,000 full-time students. During this same period a total of \$58,000,000 of construction had been completed or was under contract. Operating budgets for next year will probably be around \$12,000,000. There are now 16 junior colleges under the State University of New York and 25 privately supported institutions. The figures given for construction and operation apply only to the institutions under the State University.

In the college year 1958-59, California

TABLE IV  
*Number of Colleges and Enrollments  
 1900-1959*

School Year	Number of Colleges	Enrollment	Percentage Increase in Enrollment
1900-1901	8	100	.....
1915-1916	74	2,363	.....
1921-1922	207	16,031	.....
1925-1926	325	35,630	.....
1926-1927	408	50,529	.....
1927-1928	405	54,438	7.7
1928-1929	429	67,627	24.2
1929-1930	436	74,088	9.6
1930-1931	469	97,631	31.8
1931-1932	493	96,555	— 1.1
1932-1933	514	103,530	7.2
1933-1934	521	107,807	4.1
1934-1935	518	122,311	13.5
1935-1936	528	129,106	5.6
1936-1937	553	136,623	5.8
1937-1938	556	155,588	13.9
1938-1939	575	196,710	26.4
1939-1940	610	236,162	20.1
1940-1941	627	267,406	13.2
1941-1942	624	314,349	17.6
1942-1943	586	325,151	3.4
1943-1944	584	249,788	—23.2
1944-1945	591	251,290	0.6
1945-1946	648	295,475	17.2
1946-1947	663	455,048	54.5
1947-1948	651	500,536	10.1
1948-1949	648	465,815	— 6.9
1949-1950	634	562,786	17.2
1950-1951	597	579,475	2.8
1951-1952	593	572,193	— 1.3
1952-1953	594	560,732	— 2.0
1953-1954	598	622,864	11.1
1954-1955	596	696,321	11.8
1955-1956	635	765,551	10.0
1956-1957	652	869,720	11.36
1957-1958	667	892,642	2.56
1958-1959	677*	905,062	1.39

\* Does not include 7 foreign colleges listed formerly.

public junior colleges enrolled 73.3 per cent of all full-time students enrolled in public higher education below the junior year. This past year there were 92,000 full-

time students in the junior colleges. By 1970, it is estimated that there will be 220,000.

In a number of states the establishment

TABLE V

Growth in Number of Junior Colleges  
1900-1959

Year	Total	Public	Private	Percentage Public
1900-01	8	0	8	0
1915-16	74	19	55	26
1921-22	207	70	137	34
1925-26	325	136	189	42
1929-30	436	178	258	41
1933-34	521	219	302	42
1938-39	575	258	317	45
1947-48	651	328	323	50
1952-53	594	327	267	55
1953-54	598	338	260	57
1954-55	596	336	260	56
1955-56	635	363	272	57
1956-57	652	377	275	57.8
1957-58	667	391	276	58.6
1958-59	677*	400	277	59.1

\* Does not include 7 foreign colleges listed formerly.

or expansion of junior college facilities is a subject of current and active consideration. These include Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and Ohio.

## MODIFICATIONS IN " DIRECTORY"

This year's *Directory* utilizes the new definitions for student categories that are being employed in the compilation of data for *American Junior Colleges*, Fifth Edition, edited by Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., published by the American Council on Education, Spring, 1960. These are listed at the beginning of this *Directory*. While a changeover from one set of definitions to another limits the comparability of data from year to year, the use of standardized definitions will enhance the reliability and consistency of data gathered across the nation.

The *Directory* also reports for the first

time a synoptic picture of junior college enrollments and classifies freshman and sophomore students according to full-time or part-time categories. "Total" enrollment figures given are indicative of the number of students in the junior colleges of the country as of approximately October 15, 1958. Cumulative figures are also given so that enrollment comparisons can be made with previous years as in Table IV. The "cumulative" figures include students enrolled for first semester, second semester, and summer sessions during the year 1958-59 and special and adult students enrolled for short courses or informal education. However, instructions were given to reporting institutions to count each student only once. The "cumulative" total therefore gives some indication of the number of different people served by the college during the entire year.

## EXPLANATION OF TABLES

Table IV gives a picture of the growth in the number of institutions as well as in the total enrollment from 1900 to 1958-59. The figure given for the total number of institutions is 677. This does not include seven foreign colleges listed formerly. The actual increase, therefore, is 17 and not 10 as indicated by the table data. The rate of increase in cumulative enrollment dipped from approximately 11 per cent for the years 1953 to 1957 and then to 2.56 in 1957-58 and to 1.39 in 1958-59. Part of this decrease in the rate of growth is accounted for by the fact that seven foreign colleges with a combined enrollment of about 3,300 have not been included in the tallies, and part is explained by the drop in adult enrollments evidenced in the last two years of this record. An additional and newly emerging factor accounting for the decline in the growth rate is that a number of junior colleges, both public and private, have chosen to or have been forced to limit registrations because of full-capacity enrollments.

Table V is presented to show the growth of institutions, those under the control of public authority, those that are independent or church-related and the percentage of change between the two main types. Listed among the 677 junior colleges are all institutions accredited by state departments of education or regional accrediting associations as definitely organized two-year colleges, extension centers of universities, or teachers colleges. Until 1947-48 there were more junior colleges under private auspices than those publicly supported. However, from that time to the present the increase in the number of public institutions has been fairly consistent while the number of church-related and

independent junior colleges has remained relatively steady.

Table VI shows comparative growth and enrollments of public and private junior colleges. The number of students in the public institutions has exceeded enrollments in the privately controlled colleges since 1921-22, and the difference increased steadily in favor of the public colleges until 1951-52. Since that time the proportion enrolled in the two types of junior colleges has held fairly constant. A factor to be considered in interpreting the significance of these data is the predominant residential character of the private institutions as compared with the commuting student body of the majority of public institutions. The public junior colleges have many more part-time and adult students enrolled than do the private junior colleges.

Based on a comparison of freshman and sophomore enrollments only, the percentage of students enrolled in private institutions as of October 15, 1958, was 16.4 per cent.

Table VII shows freshman and sophomore enrollments as compared with "others." Under the latter caption are included special and adult students plus second semester and summer session registrants. The 1958-59 figure under "others" includes a number of students who would have been listed formerly as freshmen or sophomores. This fact accounts for much of the decrease in enrollments which shows up on this table. Revised definitions for student categories are listed at the beginning of the *Directory*. Both "total" enrollments as of October 15, 1958, and the year-round cumulative figures have been given for 1958-59.

Table VIII has been included in this

TABLE VI  
*Growth in Junior College Enrollment*  
*1900-1959*

Year	Total	Public	Private	Percentage Public
1900-01	100	0	100	0
1915-16	2,363	592	1,771	25
1921-22	16,031	8,349	7,682	52
1925-26	35,630	20,145	15,485	57
1929-30	74,088	45,021	29,067	61
1933-34	107,807	74,853	32,954	69
1938-39	196,710	140,545	56,165	71
1947-48	500,536	378,844	121,692	76
1951-52	572,193	495,766	76,427	87
1952-53	560,732	489,563	71,169	87
1953-54	622,864	553,008	69,856	89
1954-55	696,321	618,000	78,321	89
1955-56	765,551	683,129	82,422	89
1956-57	869,720	776,493	93,227	89.2
1957-58	892,642	793,105	99,537	88.8
1958-59	905,062*	806,849	98,213	89.1

\* Cumulative Total.

*Directory* to help the reader obtain some picture of the past development in enrollment of adult and special students as previously defined. However, because the change-over to a new set of definitions of these student categories limits comparability with other years' data, no percentage change has been entered in the 1958-59 listing. Plans are being made to continue recording percentage gain or loss of newly defined student categories in succeeding directories. One problem in tabulating adult enrollments arises from changes in the regulations in some states in regard to conditions for receiving state assistance for enrolled students. In California, those districts in which junior colleges are located may qualify for state assistance for out-of-district adult students if they are enrolled in graded classes, that is, in courses in the 13th and 14th years. It

is apparent that methods of counting students may very well affect the number of adult and special students reported. Also it is likely that the number of adult students will be related to changing economic conditions. The reader will be able to observe a much greater fluctuation in adult and special student enrollments than in freshman and sophomore enrollment.

The distribution of enrollments with respect to size of the public and private junior colleges can be observed in Table IX. As can be readily noted, the public institutions are typically much larger than privately sponsored ones. Some of the small private institutions are operated by religious orders and might be described as single purpose junior colleges, e.g., preparation for teaching in church schools or other church responsibilities. Generally speaking, the public junior colleges will

have a larger proportion of adult and part-time students enrolled.

Many junior colleges have reached a point where they can no longer be described as small institutions. While there is no general agreement about the optimum size of a junior college, a question can be raised about the use of terms which characterize junior colleges as small institutions by definition. One California county study suggests the setting of a limit of 5,500 students, while plans written in other states advise a lower figure.

#### JUNIOR COLLEGE FACULTIES

Tables I, II, and III provide data on college faculties, both part time and full time. A comparison with 1957-58 shows that in 1958-59 there was an increase of about 2,100 in the number of full-time faculty equivalents bringing the total to over 24,000. Full-time faculty rose by more than 3,400 to the 20,000 mark, while part-time faculty decreased by 2,700 to approximately 13,400.

In public junior colleges, part-time faculty decreased by about 18 per cent and

TABLE VII  
*Distribution of Enrollments*  
1936-37 to 1957-59

Year	Freshman	Sophomore	Others	Total
1936-37	73,880	41,993	20,750	136,623
1937-38	80,398	41,986	33,204	155,588
1938-39	96,687	47,174	52,849	196,710
1939-40	105,663	57,128	73,371	236,162
1940-41	104,819	60,218	102,369	267,406
1941-42	100,280	55,644	158,425	314,349
1942-43	90,810	40,981	193,360	325,151
1943-44	62,307	25,690	161,791	249,788
1944-45	117,836	36,537	140,102	251,290
1945-46	116,282	35,948	142,245	294,475
1946-47	210,805	67,406	176,837	455,048
1947-48	196,510	119,080	184,946	500,536
1948-49	172,537	100,323	192,955	465,815
1949-50	183,117	102,871	276,798	562,786
1950-51	164,523	93,622	321,330	579,475
1951-52	139,850	70,976	361,367	572,193
1952-53	156,192	70,065	334,475	560,732
1953-54	172,566	83,138	367,160	622,864
1954-55	190,634	85,802	419,885	696,321
1955-56	255,301	124,934	385,361	765,551
1956-57	291,981	136,530	441,209	869,720
1957-58	330,956	158,491	403,195	892,642
1958-59*	303,507	144,873	230,886	679,266
			(456,682†)	(905,062‡)

\* Data on enrollments given as of October 15, 1958.

† Refer to current definitions at beginning of *Directory*.

‡ Includes a number of students who formerly would have been listed as freshmen or sophomores.

§ Cumulative Total.

TABLE VIII  
*Number of Special and Adult Students  
 1947-48 to 1958-59*

Year	Number of Special Students	Percentage Increase	Number of Adult Students	Percentage Increase
1947-48	54,616	.....	130,330	.....
1948-49	50,939	— 6.7	142,016	9.0
1949-50	62,391	22.5	214,407	51.0
1950-51	60,786	— 2.6	260,544	21.5
1951-52	87,053	43.2	274,314	5.3
1952-53	75,703	—13.0	258,772	— 5.7
1953-54	94,523	24.9	272,637	5.4
1954-55	109,571	15.9	310,314	13.8
1955-56	107,113	— 2.2	278,203	—10.3
1956-57	106,139	— .09	335,070	20.6
1957-58	95,973	— 9.57	307,222	— 8.4
1958-59*	52,808	.....	178,078	.....

\*Data for October 15, 1958.

Percentage change has not been tabulated for 1958-59 since current classifications for "adult" and "special" students limit comparability with figures given here for preceding years.

TABLE IX  
*Distribution of Size of Enrollment  
 (as of October 15, 1958)*

Enrollment	Public	Private	Total
1-49	8	36	44
50-99	30	43	73
100-199	38	61	99
200-299	41	55	96
300-399	33	24	57
400-499	30	16	46
500-599	31	12	43
600-699	18	3	21
700-799	13	7	20
800-899	14	3	17
900-999	6	2	8
1000-1999	58	10	68
2000-2999	30	4	34
3000-3999	9	1	10
4000-4999	12	.....	12
5000-5999	7	.....	7
6000-6999	8	.....	8
7000-7999	4	.....	4
8000-8999	2	.....	2
Over 9000	8	.....	8
Total	400	277	677

full-time faculty rose by about 20 per cent. In private colleges part-time faculty decreased by about 12 per cent and full-time faculty rose by about 21 per cent. Full-time equivalents for all junior colleges rose by 10 per cent.

A significant trend apparent in these figures is the shifting of part-time faculty into full-time roles in both public and private institutions. In the latter instance the percentage increase of full-time faculty was almost double the percentage decrease of part-time faculty, whereas in public junior colleges the percentages were just about equal. During the past two years, the full-time faculty increased by more than 4,200, while part-time faculty registered a drop of 1,540.

#### TYPES OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

Public or tax supported junior colleges now number 400, while the privately controlled or church-related institutions total 277. Table X shows the distribution of control among the non-tax supported junior colleges.

The co-educational junior college is the prevailing type with a total of 552 institutions. There are 75 junior colleges for women and 50 for men. In terms of the number of years in which the colleges are organized, the two-year institution is by far the leading type. In view of this fact, the category listing the number of years for each institution's program has been omitted from the state-by-state listings in the *Directory*. Special footnotes have been added to indicate those institutions with more or less than two-year programs. Six hundred and thirty-five are two-year colleges; 21 list themselves as part of four-year programs; six offer education in grades 11 through 14; seven are under the

three-year plan and one offers a one-year program. Five colleges are in transition from two-year to four-year institutions.

Generally, in co-educational public junior colleges, men outnumber women by more than two to one.

#### REGIONAL ACCREDITATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

Table XI was first used in the 1958 *Directory* because of growing interest among junior colleges in regional accreditation. There is great variation among the regions and the states in the proportion of junior colleges regionally accredited. A little more than half of the nation's junior colleges now are regionally accredited. A little more than half of the nation's junior colleges now are regionally accredited. In view of the importance of regional accreditation in the public mind, those areas in which few junior colleges are accredited may well wish to consider appropriate steps for meeting this problem. Data for Table XI is presented as of October 15, 1958.

#### ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP

Institutional membership in the American Association of Junior Colleges as of the end of summer, 1959, reached a new high of 506. This is an increase of ten members over the preceding year. In a large number of states membership is either 100 per cent or close to that figure. In several states, individual institutions attached to or affiliated with universities are not allowed to apply for membership in the Association because of university regulations governing such activities. Some university departments have taken out organizational sustaining memberships and in several instances, the chief administrators of the junior colleges have become individual members.

TABLE X

*Among the private and church-related colleges the breakdown is as follows:*

Independent, non-profit .....	92
Baptist Colleges .....	29
Catholic Colleges .....	65
Lutheran Colleges .....	15
Methodist Colleges .....	31
Presbyterian Colleges .....	11
Proprietary Colleges .....	3
Others* .....	31
<b>TOTAL</b> .....	<b>277</b>

\* These represent about 20 denominational bodies and the YMCA.

TABLE XI  
*Regional Accreditation*

	Public		Private		Total No. of Colleges	Percentage Regionally Accredited
	No. of Colleges	Accredited	No. of Colleges	Accredited		
Middle States	52	27	63	27	115	46.9
New England	4	1	32	17	36	50.0
North Central	164	70	70	25	234	40.6
Northwest	26	21	6	2	32	71.9
Southern	89	57	98	57	187	61.0
Western	65	61	8	4	73	89.0
Totals	400	237	277	132	677	54.5

## Current Publications Received of Interest to Junior College Readers

Bereday, George Z. F. and Joseph A. Lauwers (eds.). *Higher Education, The Yearbook of Education 1959*. Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World Book Company, 1959. Pp. xiii + 520. This is the twenty-first issue of the *Yearbook of Education*, and the seventh under the joint sponsorship of the University of London Institute of Education and Teachers College, Columbia University. In this volume the attention of the contributors is directed to the problems of higher education throughout the world.

Bredow, Miriam. *Handbook for the Medical Secretary* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1959. Pp. v + 378. \$4.75.

This is the third revision of a textbook that was a pioneer in its field at the time of its original publication in 1943. The first edition, as well as subsequent revisions, is based on the author's experience in the offices of physicians and in the teaching of future medical secretaries.

Cronbach, Lee J. *Essentials of Psychological Testing*. (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Bros., 1959. Pp. xxi + 650. \$7.00.

The purposes stated for this book in the original edition have also guided its revision. The basic course in testing should present the principles of

testing in such a way that the student will learn to choose tests wisely for particular needs, and will be aware of the potentialities and limitations of the tests he chooses.

Galanter, Eugene (ed.). *Automatic Teaching*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959. Pp. viii + 198. \$3.25. *Automatic Teaching* is the first major effort to record and evaluate the methods associated with the newly developed field of machine teaching. Many techniques are described and critically reviewed according to their expected role in American education. The book is based on a collection of 16 papers presented at a symposium held at The University of Pennsylvania under the auspices of the U.S. Air Force.

Greenberg, Jack. *Race Relations and American Law*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959. Pp. viii + 481. \$8.50.

Wide-ranging and encyclopedic, this book is the only up-to-date treatise on the law of race relations in the United States. Citizens, as well as public officials of every rank, need to know what that law is, what it is likely to be in the future, and how it operates, in order to solve one of the major dilemmas on the American scene.

Handlin, Oscar. *John Dewey's Challenge to Education*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959. Pp. 59. \$2.50.

A Pulitzer Prize winning historian analyzes the American school and its cultural context at the beginning of John Dewey's career. He focuses on a significant moment in American educational history and points out that around the turn of the century our country needed to be aroused by the kind of stir and excitement created by the new ideas of John Dewey. Dr. Handlin maintains that Dewey was and is misunderstood, but he was an explosive force at a time when American education had gone stale.

Hawes, Gene R. (ed.). *Guide to Colleges*. New York: The New American Library, 1959. Pp. viii + 256. \$.75.

Expert, up-to-date, and easy-to-use, this unique and authoritative guide will help a student select the college that is best suited to his abilities, his interests, and his finances. Written by the editor of the College Entrance Examination Board, it contains scholastic and social facts and figures on more than 2,000 colleges, university colleges and junior colleges.

Layton, W. I. *College Arithmetic*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959. Pp. ix + 200. \$3.50.

*College Arithmetic* is intended primarily for students entering college without the mathematical understanding and skills necessary for adequate handling of the quantitative problems that arise in everyday affairs. This book may also be used advantageously in

connection with adult programs of education. The text is largely a review of arithmetic.

Mapes, C. R. *Laboratory Exercises in Science for Living*. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1959. \$3.50.

*Science for Living* provides for the student an outline of lectures and laboratory exercises in human biology. It is the result of presenting such material in the classroom for the past seven years.

Shaw, Earl B. *Anglo-American: A Regional Geography*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959. Pp. vi + 480. \$7.75.

With the purpose of clearly showing the relationships between regional land use and the actual geographic environment the author first describes regional physical features, and then concentrates on analyzing regional activities. He has focused most of his attention on Anglo-America, but also has included chapters on Greenland, Danish America, and an overview of the entire continent of North America.

Thorndike, Robert L. and Hagen, Elizabeth. *10,000 Careers*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959, Pp. vii + 346. \$8.50.

This book reports the outcomes of a study of 17,000 men who were given a battery of aptitude tests in 1943. In 1955 and 1956 information was obtained from over 10,000 of these men about the educational and vocational history of each. The analysis of aptitude test scores for these 10,000 men in relation to their later careers provides the substance of the work.

Tussing, Lyle. *Psychology for Better Living*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959. Pp. xii + 496.

The purpose of *Psychology for Better Living* is to present material that can be utilized by the young adult in meeting the problems of everyday life. This book was written for those college students who are interested in learning some of the fundamentals of psychology, as well as those who wish to know more about mental hygiene. Special consideration has been given to the information desired by lower-division college students about man's emotions, behavior, and values, as well as making material available for more effective methods of dealing with others.

Wilson, Eva D., Katherine H. Fisher and Mary E. Fuqua. *Principles of Nutrition*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959. Pp. xii + 483. \$5.95.

The purpose of this textbook is to provide basic information in nutrition at the elementary level, particularly for college students, relating the role of nutrition to their own well-being and to that of society as a whole. A background in neither chemistry nor physiology is presumed on the part of the reader. An attempt has been made through the book, however, not to avoid the concepts drawn from chemistry and physiology basic to an understanding of nutrition, but rather to explain them through features of the book developed for that purpose.



## Recent Writings... **JUDGING THE NEW BOOKS**

*The College Influence on Student Character*, by Edward D. Eddy, Jr. (185 pp.; American Council on Education; \$3.00).

This publication summarizing the results of a study of college influence on student character might well be required reading for all professional personnel engaged in higher education. This study was made possible by grants from the Calkins and the Ford Foundations and under the auspices of the American Council on Education's Committee for the Study of Character Development on Education.

Dr. Eddy has made this report thoroughly readable. The reader does not find himself enmeshed in statistical tables or professional jargon. Even though his rhetoric is clearly understandable, ideas presented are "man size."

This study was conceived because of the realization of a growing need to help future generations of college trained men and women develop traits of character equal to the leadership responsibilities which should be shouldered by educated persons. Data summarized in this volume were collected through personal visits by Dr. Eddy and his two assistants to 20 American colleges and universities in 17 states. The activities of these colleges were

observed from a participant's point of view. Observations were supplemented and/or modified by data collected during conversations and interviews with administrative personnel, faculty members, and students.

Colleges are perforce, consciously or not, engaged in character development as well as in the development of the intellect. According to this study, development of the intellect and development of character are most efficiently accomplished when they proceed together. It was also concluded that the elements in the campus community which facilitate intellectual development are also the elements which encourage development of character.

Six elements are segregated as being particularly important both to excellence in intellect and character:

1. The level of expectancy—starting with the student or faculty member where he is and challenging him to perform to the outer limits of his capacity.
2. The effect of environment—some parts of the environment contribute positively, some negatively, and other parts make no contribution to the over-all climate on the campus. The college can largely control these environmental

factors making them positive contributors.

3. The concept of teaching—the good teacher inspires students to join him. He likes and knows both his subject and his student. He is devoted to reducing his own ignorance and is not afraid to speak his convictions.
4. The organization of the curriculum—the fundamental structure within which the principal task of the college is discharged. Extracurricular experiences should augment this fundamental structure.
5. The degree of student responsibility—the productive use of student energies in productive enterprises beneficial to the college community and its membership.
6. The opportunity for religious understanding and practice—the opportunity to explore and examine religious philosophy and to find adequate grounds for commitment.

THOMAS Y. WHITLEY  
Columbus College  
Columbus, Georgia

*The Challenge of Science Education*, by Joseph S. Roucek (491 pp.; Philosophical Library; \$10).

This book is a compilation of topics on science education discussed by some thirty-two men and the American Association of Physics Teachers. Dr. Roucek, the editor, introduces the book with a chapter entitled, "The Case For and Against Science and Scientism," in which he states his belief that science can explain what is, but not what ought to be.

Among the major subdivisions of the book are discussions of the why, who, what, and how of science for general

education, elementary, secondary, and higher education. The auxiliary and comparative aspects of science education are also treated. An interesting and up-to-date description of science education in the U.S.S.R. is worthy of attention.

In addition to chapters on the usual areas of science, this book also contains one or more chapters on engineering, mathematics, medicine, conservation, industrial education, learned societies, adult education, religion, social science education, and classical education. Parts of the book are also devoted to problems of science teaching at various levels.

Included in this volume is material on the usual problems of science education, such as lack of equipment and facilities, shortage of qualified teachers, and a plea for more depth in science courses at all levels. Although adult education has witnessed an unprecedented boom during the past 15 years, science education has not contributed to this growth as it might be expected to in this scientific era. Statistics available indicate a stand-still if not a decline in science education among adults.

Colleges administrators are asked to select their most capable faculty members to staff the laboratory of the undergraduate. However, before this can be done, the writers for the American Association of Physics Teachers feel equality should be approached between total student contact hours and total student semester hours in establishing faculty teaching assignments.

Possibly the most important alterations anticipated by the writers of this book will occur in mathematics and in medical education. The authors recognize

many problems for science education and offer some solutions.

DEWEY D. DAVIS

The University of Texas  
Austin, Texas

*Plane Trigonometry*, by A. W. Goodman  
(267 pp.; Wiley).

This is a logically organized book that follows a progressive and natural order for the study of trigonometry. The author has found a practical medium between the classical and modern view in the approach to the subject. In his "Preface To The Student," he has presented many ideas that will help the student maintain his self-confidence and develop his attitude toward study of the subject, especially if he is meeting this subject for the first time. The suggestions presented here are designed to develop his ability in understanding the subject rather than to require him to memorize large quantities of rules, axioms, formulas and laws.

The illustrations are particularly clear and informative. Many problems have been worked completely in detail so as to aid the student using the book as a guide for his study of trigonometry.

The author has presented sufficient theory in his explanation; yet he has not neglected the practical application. The material is presented in such a way that the student is motivated by the explanation, and yet the basic concepts of trigonometry are presented but never oversimplified. There is no danger of missing any of the vital meanings or ideas.

The book can be used in a variety of ways. The author has prepared several outlines in "Preface To the Teacher" so that different types of courses in trigonom-

etry can be organized. The book can be used for a course where the emphasis is placed on the application of trigonometry, or if the student has had trigonometry in high school, the practical application can be safely ignored to follow the purely theoretical or analytical approaches to the subject.

The author apparently believes that trigonometry, when properly presented, is a splendid opportunity to combine "instruction in genuine mathematical reasoning with obviously useful and elementary applications." Throughout the book, importance is placed on accurate explanations of the basic concepts. Because of the organization, statements are avoided which the student will later have to "unlearn."

A section of useful information for the beginning student is found in the first part of the book entitled, "Some Preliminary Notions," which includes such ideas as a brief history of mathematical symbols, the Greek alphabet, the use and meaning of subscripts, Pythagorean Theorem, and function notation.

The first concepts of trigonometry are presented in the first chapter by such explanations as measuring the height of a tree or the width of a river. Then follows the actual explanation of the trigonometric functions of an acute angle, conjunctions, solving a triangle by using the tables of trigonometric functions and interpolation with an explanation of the theory behind interpolation. The first chapter ends by explaining the terminology used in surveying and navigation problems and practical problems using this information.

The development of the subject continues in the succeeding chapters in a

logical and reasonable order by such chapter headings as: "Logarithms," "Logarithmic Solution of Right Triangles," "Trigonometric Functions of General Angles," "Elementary Trigonometric Identities," "Oblique Triangles," "Addition Formulas and Related Topics," "Radian Measure," "Graphs of the Trigonometric Functions," "Vectors," and finally, "Complex Numbers and De Moivre's Theorem." The subject of elementary trigonometry is completely covered for a first-year college course.

The appendix contains answers to the odd-numbered problems. The book includes the following tables: squares and square roots of numbers from 1-200; four-place table of the value of trigonometric functions; five-place table of the mantissas of common logarithms and a five place table of the logarithms of the trigonometric functions.

William F. Pegg  
Mars Hill College  
Mars Hill, North Carolina

## Two Popular Books for Junior Colleges

- **EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION IN BUSINESS**

*4th Edition—By R. R. AURNER*

Here is a challenging book with a "world of tomorrow" atmosphere. It emphasizes the management concept of business communications. Principles rather than mechanics are stressed.

- **EFFECTIVE SECRETARIAL PRACTICES**

*3rd Edition—By BEAMER, HANNA, POPHAM*

This textbook is designed for the training of executive or professional secretaries. It emphasizes office organization and procedure, management problems, and the specific duties that must be learned by a competent secretary.

### SOUTH-WESTERN PUBLISHING CO.

(Specialists in Business and Economic Education)

Cincinnati 27, New Rochelle, N.Y., Chicago 5, San Francisco 3, Dallas 2

Subscribe Now to

### THE JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL

*Because:*

—America today should be well informed about the fastest growing phase of education.

—It is the only national periodical devoted to the junior-college movement.

Subscription price, \$4.00 a year

1785 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.

Washington 6, D.C.

# JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL

JAMES W. REYNOLDS, *Editor*

MARION KENNEDY, *Associate Editor*

## EDITORIAL BOARD

Representing the Regional Junior College Associations

BONNIE E. CONE  
*Charlotte College  
Charlotte, North Carolina*

WARD AUSTIN  
*College of Marin  
Kentfield, California*

WILLIAM S. GOULD  
*Grassland College  
Lamoni, Iowa*

HORACE WUBBEN  
*Mesa College  
Grand Junction, Colorado*

FREDERICK C. FERRY  
*Pine Manor Junior College  
Wellesley, Massachusetts*

JOHN L. CLARKE  
*Ricks College  
Rexburg, Idaho*

PHILIP KLEIN  
*Harcum Junior College  
Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania*

REECE D. MCLENDON  
*Northwest Mississippi Junior College  
Senatobia, Mississippi*

## BOOK REVIEW EDITORS

JAMES BLASINO  
*Pueblo College  
Pueblo, Colorado*

EDMOND M. GAGEY  
*Bradford Junior College  
Bradford, Massachusetts*

JOHN H. HARRINGTON  
*Division of Instructional  
Services  
Los Angeles Board of Education  
Los Angeles, California*

J. V. HOWELL  
*Mars Hill College  
Mars Hill, North Carolina*

LUIS M. MORTON, JR.  
*Odessa College  
Odessa, Texas*

ANNA BLANCHE MURPHY  
*Union Junior College  
Crawford, New Jersey*

IONE PETERSEN  
*Pueblo College  
Pueblo, Colorado*

JACK C. TRELOAR  
*Hinds Junior College  
Raymond, Mississippi*

MEYER WEINBERG  
*Wright Junior College  
Chicago, Illinois*

THOMAS Y. WHITLEY  
*Columbus College  
Columbus, Georgia*

VERNON E. WOOD  
*Mars Hill College  
Mars Hill, North Carolina*

# American Association of Junior Colleges

## OFFICERS

MARVIN C. KNUDSON, *President*  
*Pueblo Junior College  
Pueblo, Colorado*

EDMUND J. GLEAZER, JR., *Executive Director*  
*Washington, D. C.*

HENRY W. LITTLEFIELD, *Vice President*  
*Junior College of Connecticut  
Bridgeport, Connecticut*

R. I. MELAND, *Convention Secretary*  
*Austin Junior College  
Austin, Minnesota*

C. C. COLVERT, *Chairman*  
*Council on Research and Service  
The University of Texas  
Austin, Texas*

OSCAR H. EDINGER, JR.  
*Mt. San Antonio College  
Pomona, California*

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS

CHARLES L. HARMAN  
*Bluefield College  
Bluefield, Virginia*

HAROLD BENTLEY  
*Worcester Junior College  
Worcester, Massachusetts*

WILLIAM P. MILLER  
*Weber College  
Ogden, Utah*

KENNETH FREEMAN  
*Christian College  
Columbia, Missouri*

DONALD E. DEYO  
*Montgomery Junior College  
Takoma Park, Maryland*

GEORGE O. KILDOW  
*North Idaho Junior College  
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho*

## COUNCIL ON RESEARCH AND SERVICE

BONNIE E. CONE, *Editorial Board*  
*Charlotte College  
Charlotte, North Carolina*

ROBERT HANNELLY, *Instruction*  
*Phoenix College  
Phoenix, Arizona*

FREDERIC T. GILES, *Administration*  
*Everett Junior College  
Everett, Washington*

KENNETH G. SKAGGS, *Legislation*  
*Chipola Junior College  
Marianna, Florida*

MARVIN K. PETERSON, *Curriculum*  
*New Haven College  
New Haven, Connecticut*

ELEANOR TUPPER, *Student Personnel*  
*Endicott Junior College  
Beverly, Massachusetts*

**ECONOMICS:**  
An Introduction to  
Analysis and Policy,  
3rd Edition (1960)

by George Leland Bach,  
*Carnegie Institute of  
Technology*

Like earlier editions, the latest revision of Bach's *Economics* provides the student with the ability to use economic analysis as a major tool in reaching independent, well-considered judgments on public policy issues. Analytical material on macro-economics has been made more rigorous and thorough. Attention has been given to the problem of maintaining full employment and achieving more rapid economic growth without inflation, perhaps our number one problem. An optional chapter of managerial economics has been included.

*Published in February*  
App. 848 pp.  
Text price \$6.95

New Books from  
**PRENTICE-HALL**

**A HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION,**  
2nd Edition (1960)

by Crane Brinton, *Harvard University*; John B. Christopher, *University of Rochester*, and Robert Lee Wolff, *Harvard University*

Retaining and enhancing the features that led to the outstanding success of the earlier edition, Brinton, Christopher, and Wolff have now completely revised their two-volume set, *A History of Civilization*. Incorporating the suggestions of distinguished specialists and teachers of history, the authors have re-analyzed, reworked, and up-dated material to provide an exceptional examination of the roots of our civilization. Features of special importance include a simplified and improved treatment of medieval history and a study of the history of ideas in the twentieth-century.

*Vol. I: Published in February* App. 672 pp.  
Text price: \$7.95

*Vol. II: To be published in March* App. 704 pp.  
Text price: \$7.95

**GOVERNMENT BY THE PEOPLE**, 4th Edition (1960)

by James M. Burns, *Williams College*, and Jack Peltason, *University of Illinois*

Whereas most revisions of established texts merely bring up to date, in this new fourth edition the authors have examined *GOVERNMENT BY THE PEOPLE* with a critical eye and have rethought and rewritten major portions of it in order to take advantage of the suggestions for improvement made by teachers who have used the previous edition. The emphasis in this carefully edited, line-by-line revision is on making it more comprehensible to students, attempting to be precise without being too technical. The authors have tried not only to include the most recent developments of American government but to keep the text up-to-date in terms of developments in the field of political science.

*National Edition* App. 832 pp. Text price: \$7.50  
*National, State and Local Edition* App. 960 pp. Text price: \$7.95

*Both Editions to be published in March*



*To receive approval copies, write: Box 903*

**PRENTICE-HALL, Inc.**

Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey

